arXiv:math/0501058v7 [math.DG] 21 May 2009

Averaged Structures Associated with a Finsler Structure

May 21, 2009

Ricardo Gallego Torrome[1]
Department of Physics, Lancaster University,
Lancaster, LA1 4YB, United Kingdom & The Cockcroft Institute, UK

Abstract

Given a Finsler structure $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ on a manifold $\mathbf{M}$, a Riemannian structure $(\mathbf{M}, h)$ and a family of affine connections $\tilde{\nabla}(t)$ on $\mathbf{M}$ are defined. They are obtained as the "averaged" of the Finsler structure g and a specified linear connection in the bundle $\pi^*\mathbf{TM}$. The curvature of the averaged connection is expressed in terms of the curvature of the initial connection. The relation between geodesic rigidity in Finsler as well as Riemannian geometry are discussed. The Christoffel symbols of the Levi-Civita connection of h are directly calculated from the average metric h. As an application we obtain a rigidity result on Landsberg spaces. A generalized Chern-Gauss-Bonnet theorem is proved. Al these results motivates the notion of convex invariance. This notion is briefly introduced and motivated by the above results.

---

[1] r.gallego.torrome@lancaster.ac.uk

Supported by EPSRC and Cockcroft Institute

Contents

1 Introduction 3
- 1.1 Motivation . . . 3
- 1.2 Description of the paper . . . 6

2 Definitions and notation. The Chern connection and other Connections 8
- 2.1 The Non-Linear connection . . . 10
- 2.2 The Chern connection and the relation with other relevant connections . . . 11

3 The Riemannian averaged metric from a Finsler structure 15
- 3.1 First derivation of the metric h . . . 15
- 3.2 An alternative derivation of the metric h . . . 19
- 3.3 A coordinate-free formula for h . . . 23

4 Average linear connections, their parallel transports and curvature endomorphisms 25
- 4.1 The average linear connections of ∇ . . . 25
- 4.2 Structural theorems . . . 32
- 4.3 **New Isometric Invariants** . . . 36
- 4.4 **Relation between the Holonomy representation of ∇ and $\tilde{\nabla}$** . . . 38

5 Metric compatible with averaged connection and application to geodesic equivalence in Berwald manifolds 39

6 Bonnet-Gauss Theorem for Berwald Spaces 42

7 On a Rigidity Theorem for Landsberg Spaces 44
- 7.1 The coefficients of the Levi-Civita connection ∇^h . . . 45
- 7.2 Proof of *Theorem 7.2* . . . 49

8 Conclusion: the notion of convex invariance in Finsler Geometry 54

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation

Physical Motivation

The dynamics at the Planck scale is up to now unknown. There is plenty room for bast speculations. Let us consider the most heterodox one: Let us assume that the dynamics at this scale can be described as a discrete, deterministic physical system. Then, the state of the system at the instant t is described by a point or a finite region in the phase space $\mathbf{T}^*\mathbf{TM}$, where $\mathbf{M}$ is the "configuration manifold", $\mathbf{TM}$ the tangent bundle and $\mathbf{T}^*\mathbf{TM}$ the dual bundle of the tangent bundle. The dynamics of the system is determined by a Hamiltonian function $\mathbf{H} : \mathbf{T}^*\mathbf{TM} \longrightarrow \mathbf{R}$ through the associated Poisson structure. In references [4] and [11] is described the relation between the Hamiltonian function of a deterministic system and a geometric construction involving some special type of Finsler structures called Randers spaces. Using them one construct the Hamiltonian function as the difference

$$\mathbf{H}_t = F_t(u, p_u) - F_t(u, -p_u), \tag{1.1}$$

being $F(u, p_u)$ the Finsler function living in $\mathbf{T}^*\mathbf{TM}$ (in this context $u \in \mathbf{TM}$ and $p_u \in \mathbf{T}^*\mathbf{TM}$). This Hamiltonian function incorporates the idea of a fundamental time arrow at a fundamental level of physical description, promoting irreversible evolution as a fundamental property of the dynamical systems at the Planck's scale. Actually, this is the main justification of the above hamiltonian function, together that has a geometric character and therefore is independent of the coordinates system used to define it.

The type of models obtained are consistent if the Hamiltonian operator evolves in such a way that after a long time evolution compared with the maximal value of the internal time the Hamiltonian corresponds with a notion of distance in $\mathbf{TM}$ associated with the averaged Finsler structure. That means that for every sub-system have associated a characteristic internal time, such that a complete evolution is performed. Therefore, ergodicity is assumed in this internal evolution. Indeed, the Hamiltonian $\mathbf{H}$ is not conserved and eventually vanish and them the system is instantaneously in equilibrium. The action of the exterior system promotes again a new internal evolution and the process is again repeated. The picture is like a vortex in a fluid, that evolves preserving the macroscopic form, although the individual particles that form it changes. The role of the individual detailed evolution is given by the Hamiltonian function (1.1), while the "macroscopic shape" is given by the averaged Hamiltonian. The averaged Hamiltonian provides the generator function for translations along the external time.

For the entire universe, the period where the system full-fill a complete evolution is very short, which means that we have an universal equilibrium time by hypothesis of the order of the Planck time. For small sub-systems these periods are larger. Although this sound counterintuitive, the reason is that for a whole universe, the number of degrees of freedom is rather large while the number of available states is small (there is only one universe); for a sub-system the number of degrees of freedom is smaller (even we assume it is large) and the number of possible states is large. This suggests the following relation (also suggested elsewhere [15]),

$$Energy := \hbar \frac{1}{Period}. \tag{1.2}$$

For a finite universe, the energy is very large but finite; for a elementary sub-system, the energy is small and the period larger. This averaged Finsler structure is Riemannian and the associated total Hamiltonian is equal to zero. This must be the case for theories where microscopic parametric time "t" is a gauge degree of freedom, associating the total null-Hamiltonian with the generator of time-translations. That it should be zero can be surprising, but we should not forget we are theoretically describing the whole universe as a deterministic system in equilibrium. Therefore any stable state of the whole universe is an eigenstate with zero energy of the Hamiltonian.

After the internal evolution along the "internal or microscopic time" t, a natural division between matter (possibly including graviton, that is particles of spin 2) and gravity appears ([4]), because it is different the definition of the Hamiltonian after the averaged, that is the Hamiltonian after a "long internal term" t evolution $\mathbf{H}_T = F_T(u,p_u) - F_T(u,-p_u)$, being T the period for t. It is zero because the final structure F_T is Riemannian and therefore is a reversible Finslerian metric. However the averaged of the Hamiltonian $< F_t(u,p_u) - F_t(u,-p_u) >$ is a priori different than zero and can be associated with the Hamiltonian for matter in equilibrium at time t. Quantization of this Hamiltonian makes sense. This fact is interpreted as the formation of structures, associated with quantum states as a results of the "long term average". Meanwhile the total Hamiltonian for the whole universe is decomposed in the following way,

$$0 = \int_{\mathbf{TM}} (\mathcal{H}_{matter} + \mathcal{H}_{gravity}) =< F_0(u,p_u) - F_0(u,-p_u) > + \int_{\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}} \mathcal{H}_{gravity} =$$

$$= \int_{\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}} < F_0(u,p_u) - F_0(u,-p_u) > + \int_{\mathbf{TM}} \mathcal{H}_{gravity}$$

This formulation uses “local” densities $\mathcal{H}_{matter} + \mathcal{H}_{gravity}$ living on $\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$.

Finally, we should mention that the relation between the Hamiltonian function and the Randers structure is not only natural, but also provides a solution of an important problem of the Hilbert space formulation of the dynamics of deterministic systems proposed by G. 't Hooft([5],[6]). Therefore for this particular application, the relevant level of mathematical structure is the metric category because the Hamiltonian $\mathbf{H}_t$ is defined at the metric level and because the Quantum States are obtained as average of metric structures ([11]).

Mathematical Motivation

The introduction of Finsler Geometry by Riemann (or better, his disregarded of this geometry) has been a handicap for the historical development of the geometry. Indeed, the original argument is that Finsler geometry is much more complicated and does not produce much more insight to the geometric problems. In addition, there are a lot of results in Finsler geometry that are essentially Riemannian.

It seems that it is important to know which results are Riemannian from which results are purely Finslerian. We think that we partially we solve this problem in the following way. Given a Finsler structure, there are several relevant geometric structures that prescribed by the Finsler structure plus additional conditions on the "torsion". Differential Geometry refers to the properties of the manifold $\mathbf{M}$ that can be extracted from connections, that is, using covariant differential methods. Therefore, in the case of Finsler Geometry, the existence of these connections is fundamental. Unfortunately, the connections extracted from them are more complicated than in the Riemannian case, even that the ordinary affine space. Therefore, it is useful to obtain an affine connection that contains more of the information of the original connection. This is arguably achieved by the averaged connection presented in this paper. The class of averaged connections that we will deal with are affine connections and in general non-Riemannian. Indeed, they are in general non-metrizable. However, most of the properties that are not associated with the definition of a Levi-Civita, but with an affine connection will remain invariant in Finsler Geometry. Therefore, the study of the averaged connection and its associated curvatures can bring light on the understanding of Finsler Geometry.

In this context, there are properties that will remain the same and other which will be essential new. Between the fists, links between Finsler structure an topological properties of the manifold are the most natural candidates, while in the second class, properties related with the irreversible character of the metrics are the most pro-eminent candidates.

We should remark that being not a direct link between Finsler and Riemannian at the connection level, our theory can not provided a complete solution to the problem of characterize the difference between Riemannian and Finsler. However there is a case (Berwald spaces) where our results become more productive.

This paper has being written during the last four years, with multiple versions and subversions. The author would like to apologize for that and declare that the present version (with its possible mistakes) is what the author consider the final version.

1.2 Description of the paper

The present paper is concerned with the construction of the basic mathematical tools that we used in the above programs. The construction of the averaged Riemannian metric is natural and they could be useful to understand the geometric meaning of Finsler structures. The hypothesis is that given a family of Finsler structures, there is associated an "optimal" Riemannian structure. The meaning of optimal is in some sense depending of the case. However, using Cartan's theorem on the center of mass of distributions, our Riemannian metric is structure is optimal.

Generalizations of the Riemannian geodesic rigidity to the finslerian case are described. A Chern-Gauss-Bonnet type theorem is also obtained.

The theory developed in this work can be relevant in the solution of a classical problem in Finsler geometry: to decide if there are essential Landsberg spaces. We present a rigidity result on Landsberg spaces in the present paper. They are obtained as consequence of this general property that we called convex invariance.

The fundamental content of the work is the following. Let $\mathbf{M}$ be a n-dimensional, real, smooth manifold and let us consider a Finsler structure $(\mathbf{M}, F)$. A Riemannian structure $(\mathbf{M}, h)$ is obtained "averaging" the initial Finsler structure $(\mathbf{M}, F)$. The average operation can be extended to other operators over sections of $\mathbf{\Gamma M}$ in such way that, for instance we can average the initial Chern's connection (indeed a similar construction holds for any linear connection in the vector bundle $\pi^*\mathbf{TM}$). In the general case, it is not the Levi-Civita connection of h, but it contains relevant information from the initial structure in a linear connection living on $\mathbf{M}$. We study the parallel transport and curvature endomorphism of the average connection. We can also compare explicitly this connection with the Levi-Civita connection of h, because we know the components of the metric h in terms of the initial structure F.

The applications of this formalism contained in this work is the following. First we related the notion of geodesic equivalence in Finsler geometry with the corresponding notion in the Riemannian case. We restrict our selves to the case of Berwald spaces. Also in this category, we give a criterion for being a Berwald space. Finally, we provide a generalization to Berwald spaces of arbitrary dimension of the Chern-Gauss-Bonnet theorem.

In Section 3, we explain the measure used for the integration of sections of the vector bundles $\pi^*\mathbf{\Gamma M}$ over the split tangent bundle $\mathbf{N} = \mathbf{TM} \setminus \{0\}$. With this measure we obtain the Riemannian structure $(\mathbf{M}, h)$ from the initial Finsler structure $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ performing an "average" on the indicatrices $\mathbf{I}_x$, $\forall x \in \mathbf{M}$.

In Section 4 we perform the construction of the average linear connection $\tilde{\nabla}$. We also have completed this result with the calculation of the parallel transport operator and curvatures of $\tilde{\nabla}$ in terms of the corresponding operations associated to the Chern connection ∇ and comparing the Holonomy groups $Hol(\nabla)$ and $\tilde{\nabla}$. These results are also valid for generic linear connection on $\pi^*\mathbf{TM}$.

In section 5, we apply the construction of *Section 3* to Berwald spaces, showing that in this case, for hyperbolic manifolds, the average connection of the Chern connection $\tilde{\nabla}$ is the Levi-Civita of the average Riemannian metric h.

In Section 6 the Christoffel symbols of the Levi-Civita connection of $(\mathbf{M}$,$h)$ are obtained. This formula is used to prove that $\mathcal{C}^4$-Landsberg structures, when additional conditions hold, are Berwald spaces. In particular we prove *Theorem 5.2*, being a rigidity result on Landsberg spaces. This is an example of an application of the "convex invariance method".

In section 7, we proof a generalized Gauss-Bonnet-Chern theorem for arbitrary n-dimensional Berwald spaces.

In section 8, based on above examples, the notion of convex invariance is introduced briefly and motivated for some examples of the present work and additional results and ideas developed elsewhere.

2 Definitions and notation. The Chern connection and other Connections

Let $(x, \mathbf{U})$ be a local coordinate system over a point $x \in \mathbf{M}$, where $x \in \mathbf{U}$ have local coordinates $(x^1, ..., x^n)$, $\mathbf{U} \subset \mathbf{M}$ is an open set and $\mathbf{TM}$ is the tangent bundle of the manifold $\mathbf{M}$. We use Einstein's convention for up and down equal indices in this work if the contrary is not directly stated.

A tangent vector at the point $x \in \mathbf{M}$ is denoted by $y^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$, $y^i \in \mathbf{R}$. We also denote by $\mathbf{TM}$ the set of sections of the tangent bundle. We can identify the point x with its coordinates $(x^1, ..., x^n)$ and the tangent vector $y \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$ at x with its components $y = (y^1, ..., y^n)$. Then each local coordinate system $(x, \mathbf{U})$ on the manifold $\mathbf{M}$ induces a local coordinate system on $\mathbf{TM}$ denoted by $(x, y, \mathbf{U})$ such that $y = y^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$ has local natural coordinates $(x^1, ..., x^n, y^1, ..., y^n)$ in this coordinate system. The spilt tangent bundle is $\pi : \mathbf{N} \longrightarrow \mathbf{M}$ such that $\mathbf{N} = \mathbf{TM} \setminus 0$.

Definition 2.1 *A Finsler structure F on the manifold $\mathbf{M}$ is a non-negative, real function $F : \mathbf{TM} \to [0, \infty[$ such that*

1. *It is smooth in the split tangent bundle $\mathbf{N}$.*
2. *Positive homogeneity holds: $F(x, \lambda y) = \lambda F(x, y)$ for every $\lambda > 0$.*
3. *Strong convexity holds: the Hessian matrix*

$$g_{ij}(x, y) := \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 F^2(x, y)}{\partial y^i \partial y^j} \tag{2.1}$$

is positive definite in $\mathbf{N}$.

Usually we will also denote by a Finsler structure the pair $(\mathbf{M}, F)$. The minimal smoothness requirement for the Finsler structure is $\mathcal{C}^5$ function $F : \mathbf{N} \longrightarrow \mathbf{R}^+$, when second Bianchi identities are required to exists; more generally only $\mathcal{C}^4$ differentiable structure is required. The matrix $g_{ij}(x, y)$ is the matrix-components of the fundamental tensor g. The homogeneity condition can be stronger: $F(x, \lambda y) = |\lambda| F(x, y)$. In this case $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ is called absolutely homogeneous Finsler structure.

Definition 2.2 ([2]) *Let $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ be a Finsler structure and $(x, y, \mathbf{U})$ a local coordinate system induced on $\mathbf{TM}$ from the coordinate system $(x, \mathbf{U})$ of $\mathbf{M}$. The components of the Cartan tensor are defined by the set of functions:*

$$A_{ijk} = \frac{F}{2} \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial y^k}, \quad i, j, k = 1, ..., n. \tag{2.2}$$

These coefficients are homogeneous of degree zero in $(y^1, ..., y^n)$. In the Riemannian case A_{ijk} are zero, and this fact characterizes Riemannian geometry from other types of Finsler geometries.

Because the components of the fundamental and the Cartan tensor depend on the vector $y \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$, it is natural to use other manifold instead of $\mathbf{M}$ in order to study their properties. A natural construction is the following([2]): consider the vector bundle $\pi^*\mathbf{TM}$, pull back of $\mathbf{TM}$ by the projection π defined by:

$$\pi : \mathbf{N} \longrightarrow \mathbf{M}, \quad u \longrightarrow x,\, u \in \mathbf{N},\, x \in \mathbf{M}.$$

$\pi^*\mathbf{TM}$ has base manifold $\mathbf{N}$, the fiber over the point $u \in \mathbf{N}$ with coordinates (x, y) is isomorphic to $\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$ for every point $u \in \pi^{-1}(x)$ and the structure group is isomorphic to $\mathbf{GL}(n, \mathbf{R})$.

An alternative treatment of Finsler geometry uses the fact of the homogeneity properties. In fact, for positive homogeneous metrics, one can study the geometry of the analogous pull-back but on the base manifold being the sphere bundle. The sphere bundle $\mathbf{SM}$ is defined as follows. Consider the manifold $\mathbf{N}$ and the projection π given by:

$$\pi_S : \mathbf{N} \longrightarrow \mathbf{SM}, \quad (x, y) \longrightarrow (x, \frac{y}{\|y\|_E}).$$

$\|\cdot\|_E$ is the Euclidean norm in $\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$. An equivalence class $[y_0]$ is determined by the set of points in $\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$, $[y_0] := \{(x, y) \,|\, y = \lambda y_o,\ \forall\lambda > 0\,\}$. $\mathbf{SM}$ is a fiber bundle over the manifold $\mathbf{M}$, with fiber over the point $x \in \mathbf{M}$ homeomorphic to the sphere $\mathbf{S}^{n-1}$ and with projection

$$\pi : \mathbf{SM} \longrightarrow \mathbf{M}, \quad (x, [y]) \longrightarrow x.$$

Then, one can construct as before the pull-back bundle $\pi^*\mathbf{TM}$ as before. If the structure F is absolutely homogeneous of degree zero, then one can define the projective bundle, where similarly to the sphere bundle is defined as

$$\pi_S : \mathbf{N} \longrightarrow \mathbf{PTM}, \quad (x, y) \longrightarrow (x, [y]),$$

defining the equivalence class as $[y] := \{(x, y) \,|\, y = \lambda y_o,\ \forall\lambda \neq 0\,\}$

The matrix coefficients $\big(g_{ij}(x, y)\big)$ are also invariant under a positive scaling of y and therefore they live in $\mathbf{SM}$. The Cartan tensor components A_{ijk} also live in $\mathbf{SM}$, if they are defined according to the above formula. If F is absolutely homogeneous rather than positive homogeneous the coefficients g_{ij} and A_{ijk} live in $\mathbf{PTM}$, the projective tangent bundle. $\mathbf{PTM}$ is defined in a similar way as **SM** but the projection also sends y and $-y$ to the same equivalence class $[y_0]$.

$\pi^*\mathbf{SM}$ is a natural framework to study Finsler geometry. Nevertheless it is equivalent to work in the bundle $\pi^*\mathbf{TM}$ if in the last case we work explicitly with invariant objects under the scaling $y \to \lambda y$, $\lambda > 0$, because then the operations are indirectly performed on objects living in **SM** and the results are also living on **SM**, when the operators are conveniently defined.

2.1 The Non-Linear connection

There is a non-linear connection in the manifold **N** defined in the following way. Firstly we introduce the non-linear connection coefficients, defined by the formula

$$\frac{N^i_j}{F} = \gamma^i_{jk}\frac{y^k}{F} - A^i_{jk}\gamma^k_{rs}\frac{y^r}{F}\frac{y^s}{F}, \quad i,j,k,r,s = 1,...,n$$

where the *formal second kind Christoffel's symbols* γ^i_{jk} are defined in local coordinates by the expression

$$\gamma^i_{jk} = \frac{1}{2}g^{is}(\frac{\partial g_{sj}}{\partial x^k} - \frac{\partial g_{jk}}{\partial x^s} + \frac{\partial g_{sk}}{\partial x^j}), \quad i,j,k = 1,...,n;$$

$A^i_{jk} = g^{il}A_{ljk}$ and $g^{il}g_{lj} = \delta^i_j$. Note that the coefficients $\frac{N^i_j}{F}$ are invariant under the scaling $y \to \lambda y$, $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}^+$, $y \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$.

Let us consider the local coordinate system $(x, y, \mathbf{U})$ of the manifold **TM**. A tangent basis for $\mathbf{T}_u\mathbf{N}$, $u \in \mathbf{N}$ is defined by the vectors([2]):

$$\{\frac{\delta}{\delta x^1}|_u, ..., \frac{\delta}{\delta x^n}|_u, F\frac{\partial}{\partial y^1}|_u, ..., F\frac{\partial}{\partial y^n}|_u\},$$

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta x^j}|_u = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}|_u - N^i_j\frac{\partial}{\partial y^i}|_u, \quad i,j = 1,...,n.$$

The set of local sections $\{\frac{\delta}{\delta x^1}|_u, ..., \frac{\delta}{\delta x^n}|_u,\ u \in \pi^{-1}(x),\ x \in \mathbf{U}\}$ generates the local horizontal distribution $\mathcal{H}_U$, while $\{\frac{\partial}{\partial y^1}|_u, ..., \frac{\partial}{\partial y^n}|_u,\ u \in \pi^{-1}(x),\ x \in \mathbf{U}\}$ the vertical distribution $\mathcal{V}_U$. The subspaces $\mathcal{V}_u$ and $\mathcal{H}_u$ are such that the following splitting of $\mathbf{T}_u\mathbf{N}$ holds:

$$\mathbf{T}_u\mathbf{N} = \mathcal{V}_u \oplus \mathcal{H}_u,\ \forall\ u \in \mathbf{N}.$$

This decomposition is invariant by the action of $\mathbf{GL}(n, \mathbf{R})$ and it defines a non-linear connection (a connection in the sense of Ehresmann([3])) on the principal fiber bundle $\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{GL}(n, \mathbf{R}))$.

The local basis of the dual vector space $\mathbf{T}^*_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{N}$, $u \in \mathbf{N}$ is

$$\{dx^1|_u, ..., dx^n|_u, \frac{\delta y^1}{F}|_u, ..., \frac{\delta y^n}{F}|_u\},$$

$$\frac{\delta y^i}{F}|_u = \frac{1}{F}(dy^i + N^i_j dx^j)|_u, \quad i, j = 1, ..., n.$$

This basis is dual of the basis for $\mathbf{T}_u\mathbf{N}$ considered before.

The covariant splitting $\mathbf{T}_u\mathbf{N} = \mathcal{V}_u \oplus \mathcal{H}_u$ is equivalent to the existence of the non-linear connection and allows to define the Riemannian metric on the manifold $\mathbf{N}$ as

$$g_N = g_{ij} dx^i \otimes dx^j + g_{ij}\frac{\delta y^i}{F} \otimes \frac{\delta y^j}{F}, \; i, j = 1, ..., n.$$

known as Sasaki-type metric. With respect to this metric, the horizontal subspace spanned by the distributions $\{\frac{\delta}{\delta x^j}, \, j = 1, ..., n\}$ is orthogonal respect the distribution developed by $\{\frac{\partial}{\partial y^j}, \, j = 1, ..., n\}$.

2.2 The Chern connection and the relation with other relevant connections

The non-linear connection provides the possibility to define an useful geometric tool as it is the Chern connection. Let us consider $x \in \mathbf{M}$, $u \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}\setminus\{0\}$ and $\xi \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$. We define the canonical projections

$$\pi : \mathbf{N} \longrightarrow \mathbf{M}, \quad u \longrightarrow x,$$

$$\pi_1 : \mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{TM} \longrightarrow \mathbf{N}, \quad (u, \xi_x) \longrightarrow u,$$

$$\pi_2 : \mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{TM} \longrightarrow \mathbf{TM}, \quad (u, \xi_x) \longrightarrow \xi_x,$$

with $u \in \pi^{-1}(x), x \in \mathbf{M}$. Then the vector bundle $\pi^*\mathbf{TM}$ is completely determined as a subset of $\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{TM}$ by the equivalence relation defined in the following way: for every $u \in \mathbf{N}$ and $(u, \xi) \in \pi_1^{-1}(u)$,

$$(u, \xi) \in \pi^*\mathbf{TM} \quad \text{iff} \quad \pi \circ \pi_2(u, \xi) = \pi(u).$$

$\pi^*\mathbf{TM} \subset \mathbf{TM} \times \mathbf{N}$ and the projection on the first and second factors are also denoted by

$$\pi_1 : \pi^*\mathbf{TM} \longrightarrow \mathbf{N}, \quad (u, \xi) \longrightarrow u,$$

$$\pi_2 : \pi^*\mathbf{TM} \longrightarrow \mathbf{TM}, \quad (u, \xi) \longrightarrow \xi,$$

with $\xi \in \pi_1^{-1}(u)$. We can define in a similar way the vector bundle $\pi^*\mathbf{SM}$ over $\mathbf{SM}$, with $\pi : \mathbf{SM} \longrightarrow \mathbf{M}$ in case of positive homogeneous Finsler structures or over $\mathbf{PTM} :\longrightarrow \mathbf{M}$ in case of absolutely homogeneous Finsler structures.

Definition 2.3 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Finsler structure. The fundamental and the Cartan tensors are defined in the natural local coordinate system* $(x, y, \mathbf{U})$ *by the equations:*

1. *Fundamental tensor:*

$$g(x,y) := \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2 F^2(x,y)}{\partial y^i \partial y^j}\, dx^i \otimes dx^j. \tag{2.3}$$

2. *Cartan tensor:*

$$A(x,y) := \frac{F}{2}\frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial y^k}\,\frac{\delta y^i}{F} \otimes dx^j \otimes dx^k = A_{ijk}\,\frac{\delta y^i}{F} \otimes dx^j \otimes dx^k. \tag{2.4}$$

The Chern connection ∇ is determined through the structure equations for the connection 1-forms as follows ([2]),

Theorem 2.4 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Finsler structure. The vector bundle* $\pi^*\mathbf{TM}$ *admits a unique linear connection characterized by the connection 1-forms* $\{\omega^i_j,\ i,j = 1,...,n\}$ *such that the following structure equations hold:*

1. *"Torsion free" condition,*

$$d(dx^i) - dx^j \wedge w^i_j = 0, \quad i,j = 1,...,n. \tag{2.5}$$

2. *Almost g-compatibility condition,*

$$dg_{ij} - g_{kj}w^k_i - g_{ik}w^k_j = 2A_{ijk}\frac{\delta y^k}{F}, \quad i,j,k = 1,...,n. \tag{2.6}$$

Torsion freeness condition is equivalent to the absence of terms containing dy^i in the connection 1-forms ω^i_j and also implies the symmetry of the connection coefficients Γ^i_{jk}([2]):

$$w^i_j = \Gamma^i_{jk}\, dx^k, \quad \Gamma^i_{jk} = \Gamma^i_{kj}. \tag{2.7}$$

Torsion freeness condition and almost g-compatibility determines the expression of the connection coefficients of the Chern connection in terms of the Cartan and fundamental tensor components ([2]).

Following theorem 2.4, there is a coordinate-free characterization of the Chern connection. Let us denote by $V(S)$ the vertical and by $H(S)$ the horizontal components of a tangent vector $X \in \mathbf{T}_u\mathbf{N}$ defined by the non-linear connection on $\mathbf{N}$. Then the following corollaries are immediate consequences of *Theorem 2.4* and will be used in *Section 4* for the canonical construction of the average connection. However instead of describing directly the connection ∇, we describe the associated covariant derivative ∇_X, $X \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{N}$ in the following way:

Corollary 2.5 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Finsler structure. The almost* g*-compatibility condition* (2.6) *is equivalent to the conditions:*

$$\nabla_{V(X)}g = 2A(X, \cdot, \cdot), \tag{2.8}$$

$$\nabla_{H(X)}g = 0. \tag{2.9}$$

Proof: Using local natural coordinates and reading from *theorem 2.4*, we have that the covariant derivative of the metric is

$$\nabla(g) = (dg_{ij} - g_{kj}w^k_i - g_{ik}w^k_j)\pi^* e^i \otimes \pi^* e^j \ = \ 2A_{ijk}\frac{\delta y^k}{F} \otimes \pi^* e^i \otimes \pi^* e^j.$$

By the definition of covariant derivative along a direction and nothing that $2A_{ijk}\frac{\delta y^k}{F}$ is vertical, one gets,

$$\nabla_{\Xi}(g) := \ 2A_{ijk}\frac{\delta y^k}{F}(\chi)\, \pi^* e^i \otimes \pi^* e^j, \ \forall \chi \in \mathbf{TN}.$$

From this formula follows the result. □

Corollary 2.6 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Finsler structure. The torsion-free condition* (2.5) *is equivalent to the following conditions:*

1. *Null vertical covariant derivative of sections of* $\pi^*\mathbf{TM}$*: let* $\tilde{X} \in \mathbf{TN}$ *and* $Y \in \mathbf{TM}$*, then*
$$\nabla_{V(\tilde{X})}\pi^* Y = 0. \tag{2.10}$$

2. *Let us consider* $X, Y \in \mathbf{TM}$ *and the associated horizontal vector fields* $\tilde{X} = X^i \frac{\delta}{\delta x^i}$ *and* $\tilde{Y} = Y^i \frac{\delta}{\delta x^i}$*. Then the following equality holds:*
$$\nabla_{\tilde{X}}\pi^* Y - \nabla_{\tilde{Y}}\pi^* X - \pi^*([X, Y]) = 0. \tag{2.11}$$

Proof: as before we consider the torsion condition in local coordinates where the local frame $\{e_j\}$ of $\Gamma\mathbf{TM}$ commutes, $[e_i, e, j] = 0$. Then symmetry in the connection coefficients and the definition of the torsion operator (2.11), one obtains that

$$\nabla_{\tilde{e_i}}\pi^* e_j - \nabla_{\tilde{e_j}}\pi^* e_i - \pi^*([e_i, e_j]) = \nabla_{\tilde{e_i}}\pi^* e_j - \nabla_{\tilde{e_j}}\pi^* e_i \ = (\Gamma^k_{ij} - \Gamma^k_{ji})\, \pi^* e_k = 0.$$

In order to proof the second condition, it is as follows,

$$\nabla_{V(\tilde{X})}\pi^* Y := \pi^* e_k\, w^k_j(V(e_i) = \pi^* e_k \Gamma^k_{dj} dx^d(V(e_i)) = \pi^* e_k \Gamma^k_{dj} dx^d(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^i}) = 0. \square$$

The curvature endomorphisms associated with the connection w are determined by the covariant exterior differential of the connection 1-forms $\{\omega^i_j\}$,

$$\Omega^i_j := dw^i_j - w^k_j \wedge w^i_k,\ i,j,k = 1, ..., n. \tag{2.12}$$

In local coordinates, these curvature endomorphisms are decomposed in the following way:

$$\Omega^i_j = \frac{1}{2}R^i_{jkl}dx^k \wedge dx^l + P^i_{jkl}dx^k \wedge \frac{\delta y^l}{F} + \frac{1}{2}Q^i_{jkl}\frac{\delta y^k}{F} \wedge \frac{\delta y^l}{F}. \tag{2.13}$$

The quantities R^i_{jkl}, P^i_{jkl} and Q^i_{jkl} are called the hh, hv, and vv-curvature tensor components of the Chern connection. In particular, for the Chern connections it holds that the last component is identically zero $Q = 0$ ([2]) for arbitrary Finsler structures.

Other example of a linear connection that is important in Finsler geometry is Cartan's connection. Cartan's connection is complete metric compatible, but have non-trivial torsion ([12]). The relation between the Cartan connection 1-forms $(\omega_c)^k_i$ in relation with the Chern connection ω^k_i 1-forms are given by ([2]):

$$(\omega_c)^k_i = \omega^k_i\ +\ A^k_{ij}\frac{\delta y^j}{F},\ i,j,k = 1, ...n.$$

We should mention that our results of *Section 3* and the main results of *Section 4* are generally valid for any linear connection on $\pi^*\mathbf{TM}$.

3 The Riemannian averaged metric from a Finsler structure

Let us consider the vector bundle $\mathbf{\Gamma M}$ of the smooth sections of tensor fields over $\mathbf{M}$ and $\pi^*\mathbf{\Gamma M}$, the pull-back bundle by the projection $\pi : \mathbf{\Gamma M} \longrightarrow \mathbf{M}$. In this section we introduce the measure used in the average of operators acting on sections of $\pi^*\mathbf{\Gamma M}$. Secondly, we prove the existence of a Riemannian structure $(\mathbf{M}, h)$ associated in a natural way with the Finsler structure $(\mathbf{M}, F)$. This is achieved through an "averaged" of the fundamental tensor g associated with Finsler structure $(\mathbf{M}, F)$. An alternative derivation of the Riemannian metric h is presented, this time changing the manifold where it is averaged. In addition, a geometric formula for h in terms of canonical projections is given.

3.1 First derivation of the metric h

Let $(x, \mathbf{U})$ be a local coordinate system on the base manifold $\mathbf{M}$ and (x, y) be the induced local coordinate system on the tangent bundle $\mathbf{TM}$. The n-form $d^n y \in \mathbf{\Lambda}^n \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$ is defined in local coordinates as

$$d^n y = \sqrt{det\, g(x,y)}\, dy^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dy^n. \tag{3.1}$$

$det\, g(x,y)$ is the determinant of the fundamental matrix $g_{ij}(x,y)$. This n-form $d^n y$ is invariant under local coordinate changes induced from local coordinate changes in $\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$ on the manifold $\mathbf{M}$ ([2]). Let us denote by $g_x(y) = g(x,y)$. Then the pair $(\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M} \setminus \{0\}, g_x)$ is a Riemannian structure and the volume form (3.1) induces a diffeomorphic invariant volume form in $\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M} \setminus \{0\}$ that it is used in the average operation,

Definition 3.1 *Let us consider the local coordinate system* $(x, y, \mathbf{U})$ *of* $\mathbf{TM}$. *The volume form for the manifold* $\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M} \setminus \{0\}$ *is defined to be the n-form* $d^n y$.

An immediate generalization of the notion of indicatrix ([2]) motivates the following notation:

Definition 3.2 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Finsler structure. The sub-manifold*

$$\mathbf{I}_x := \{y \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M} \mid F(x,y) = 1\} \subset \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$$

is the indicatrix over the point $x \in \mathbf{M}$.

It is a compact and strictly convex sub-manifold of $\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$ ([2]). Consider the metric $\tilde{g}$ on $\mathbf{I}_x$ induced from $(\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}\backslash\{0\}, g_x)$ through an isometric embedding. Then the pair $(\mathbf{I}_x, \tilde{g})$ is a Riemannian manifold.

Proposition 3.3 ([2]) *The induced volume form on the Riemannian manifold* $(\mathbf{I}_x, \tilde{g})$ *is given by*

$$dvol := \sqrt{det\,\tilde{g}}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(-1)^{j-1}y^j dy^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{dy^j} \wedge \cdots \wedge dy^n, \tag{3.2}$$

where the monomial $\hat{dy^j}$ *does not appear in the corresponding term of the sum and with* $y \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$ *subjected to the constrain* $F(x,y) = 1$.

This is just the restriction of the n-form (3.1) to the sub-manifold $(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{I}_x)$.

By definition the volume function $vol(\mathbf{I}_x)$ is defined by:

$$vol(\mathbf{I}_x) = \int_{\mathbf{I}_x} \psi(x,y)\, dvol. \tag{3.3}$$

The natural definition $\psi(x,y) = 1$ provides us a natural notion of Finslerian Volume.

Definition 3.4 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Finsler structure. A family of sub-manifolds* $\Delta := \{\Delta_x \subset \mathbf{N},\, x \in \mathbf{M}\}$ *is called an invariant set of sub-manifolds if it invariant under horizontal parallel transport using the non-linear connection. An invariant measure is a pair* (ψ, Δ) *composed by a positive function* $\psi : \mathbf{N} \longrightarrow \mathbf{R}$ *with zero horizontal covariant derivative* $H(X)\psi = 0$ *and a set of invariant sub-manifolds* Δ.

$(F, \Delta = \{\mathbf{I}_x, x \in \mathbf{M}\})$ is an invariant measure when the indicatrix $\mathbf{I}_x$ is considered as a sub-manifold of $\mathbf{N}$. Horizontal invariance is a consequence of the definition of the Chern connection.

Let us denote by $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{I}_x)$ the ring of real, smooth functions over the indicatrix $\mathbf{I}_x$. Then the averaged operation acting on this ring is defined as

Definition 3.5 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Finsler structure. Let* $f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{I}_x)$ *be a real, smooth function defined on the indicatrix* $\mathbf{I}_x$ *and* (ψ, Δ) *the invariant measure defined above. We define the averaged of* f *by*

$$\begin{aligned} <\cdot>_\psi : \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{I}_x) &\longrightarrow \mathbf{R} \\ f(x,y) &\longrightarrow \frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)}\int_{\mathbf{I}_x} dvol\, \psi(x,y)\, f(x,y). \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

More explicitly, we perform the following integration of $(n-1)$-forms to define the integral of the function $f(x,y) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{I}_x)$,

$$< f(x,y) > (x) = \frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)} \int_{\mathbf{I}_x} \sqrt{det\tilde{g}}\, \psi(x,y) \big(\sum_{k=1}^{n} y^k (-1)^{k-1} dy^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dy^{k-1} \wedge$$

$$\wedge\, dy^{k+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dy^n \big).$$

The norm of the measure is given by $< 1 >_\psi$. Since $\mathbf{I}_x$ is compact, we can always get a normalized measure dividing the initial measure function ψ by the volume $vol(\mathbf{I}_x)$.

We define the Riemannian metric h. First we fix the invariant measure by putting $\psi = F$ and $\Delta = \{\mathbf{I}_x, x \in \mathbf{M}\}$. $\mathbf{I}_x$ should be considered as a submanifold of $\mathbf{N}$. For this invariant measure (F, Δ), we denote the averaged of the function $f \in \mathcal{F}\mathbf{N}$ by $< f >$.

Definition 3.6 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Finsler structure. Let us define the matrix components by*

$$h_{ij}(x) := < g_{ij}(x,y) >, \quad \forall x \in \mathbf{M}. \tag{3.5}$$

In case of smooth Finsler structures the coefficients $\{h_{ij},\, i,j = 1,..,n\}$ are smooth.

Proposition 3.7 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Finsler structure. Then the coefficients* $h_{ij}(x), i,j = 1,...,n$ *are the components of a Riemannian metric defined in* $\mathbf{M}$ *such that in the local coordinate system* $(x, \mathbf{U})$ *the metric is*

$$h(x) = h_{ij}\, dx^i \otimes dx^j. \tag{3.6}$$

Proof: Because the integration of a positive defined, real, symmetric $n \times n$ matrix is also a positive defined, real symmetric matrix, $\{h_{ij},\, i,j = 1,...,n\}$ are the components of a $n \times n$ matrix of this type. Let us consider $h(x) = h_{ij}(x)\, dx^i \otimes dx^j$, where $\{dx^1, ..., dx^n\}$ is a basis for $\mathbf{T}^*_x\mathbf{M}$. We must check the tensorial character of the expression (3.6). It is enough to check the transformation rule of the coefficients h_{ij} under changes of local coordinates in the manifold $\mathbf{M}$. But it is clear from *Definition* 3.6, from the transformation rule of g and the invariance of the norm by coordinates transformations of the form $x \to \tilde{x}(x)$, $y^i \to \tilde{y}^i = \frac{\partial \tilde{x}^i}{\partial x^j} y^j$ that

$$F(x,y) = \tilde{F}(\tilde{x}(x), \tilde{y}(y)), \quad \mathbf{I}_x = \tilde{\mathbf{I}}_{\tilde{x}}, \quad \tilde{g}_{ij}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = \frac{\partial x^l}{\partial \tilde{x}^j} \frac{\partial x^k}{\partial \tilde{x}^i} g_{lk}(x,y),$$

being $\tilde{\mathbf{I}}_{\tilde{x}} = \{y \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M} \mid \tilde{F}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = 1\}$ These relations implies the transformation rule for $h_{ij}(x)$ for the metric coefficients:

$$\tilde{h}_{ij}(\tilde{x}) = \frac{\partial x^l}{\partial \tilde{x}^i}\frac{\partial x^k}{\partial \tilde{x}^j} h_{lk}(x).$$

□

Remark 3.8 A different averaged Riemannian metric was considered in reference [7], where the integration was performed using the Haar measure of the Holonomy group of the Berwald connection of a Berwald structure. However we stress the differences between both procedures:

1. In order to define our covariant derivative, we do not introduce any connection.
2. On the contrary than in [7], where the construction was performed only for Berwald spaces, we define the averaged for a general Finsler structure.

The measure used in the definition of the averaged is natural because it only involves the initial Finsler structure $(\mathbf{M}, F)$. However, from the same Finsler structure $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ we can define other different average operations, as the following examples show.

Example 3.9 Another natural Riemannian structure is just obtained with a different normalization; with the same notation as before,

$$h_s(x) = \frac{1}{vol_E(\mathbf{S^n}_x)}\Big(\int_{\mathbf{I}_x} \psi(x,y)\, g_{ij}(x,y)\, dvol\Big) dx^i \otimes dx^j; \qquad (3.7)$$

$vol_E(\mathbf{S^n}_x)$ is the Euclidean volume of the standard sphere. Although this measure is not normalized to 1 when $\psi(x,y) = 1$, in the case of Riemannian structures the averaged coincides with the initial metric,

$$h_s(x) = \frac{1}{vol_E(\mathbf{S^n}_x)}\Big(\int_{\mathbf{I}_x} \psi(x,y)\, g_{ij}(x,y)\, dvol\Big) dx^i \otimes dx^j =$$

$$= \frac{1}{vol_E(\mathbf{S^n}_x)}\Big(\int_{\mathbf{S^n}_x} \psi(x,y)\, g_{ij}(y)\, dvol\Big)\, dx^i \otimes dx^j = g(x).$$

In the Finsler case, the relation between h_s and h is only a conformal factor relating the volume of the indicatrix and the Euclidean volume of the tangent sphere:

$$h_s(x) = \frac{Vol(\mathbf{I}_x)}{Vol(\mathbf{S^n}_x)} h(x).$$

Example 3.10 Any real, analytical and positive function $f : \mathbf{R}^+ \to \mathbf{R}^+$ defines a measure $\psi = f \circ F$ and $\Delta = \{\mathbf{I}_x,\, x \in \mathbf{M}\}$. The averaged gives the same result than in the initial metric h, but we have to multiply by the metric by a generalized conformal factor;

$$h_{ij} := \int_{\mathbf{I}_x} f \cdot F(x,y)\, g_{ij}(x,y)\, dvol_y = \; f(i,j) \int_{\mathbf{I}_x} F(x,y)\, g_{ij}(x,y)\, dvol_y.$$

It is generalized conformal because the factor $f(i,j)$ depend on the directions (i,j). This is indeed a generalization of the almost-conformal transformations. Finally let us note that the main difference with the measure in *Definition 3.5* is that the new norm is not invariant by parallel transport of the Chern connection.

Example 3.11 Consider a family $\Delta = \{\boldsymbol{\Delta}_x,\, x \in \mathbf{M}\}$ of invariant compact sub-manifolds of $\mathbf{N}$ labelled on $\mathbf{M}$ such that every $\boldsymbol{\Delta}_x$ is not homotopic to the indicatrix $\mathbf{I}_x$. We perform the average on each of these manifolds using the volume form (3.2) of the metric $\tilde{g}$ induced from g. The density function is $\psi = CF$, being C a real, smooth function over $\mathbf{M}$:

$$h_{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}(x) = \frac{1}{vol(\boldsymbol{\Delta}_x)} \int_{\boldsymbol{\Delta}_x} C(x) F^n g_{ij}(x,y)\, dx^i \otimes dx^j. \tag{3.8}$$

As in *example 3.10*, this measure is not invariant.

3.2 An alternative derivation of the metric h

In the above sub-section a natural "average" of the fundamental tensor g on the indicatrix $\mathbf{I}_x$, obtaining the components of the Riemannian metric h at the point x. The same metric is obtained when the integration is performed in some sub-manifolds of $\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M} \subset \mathbf{N}$ of co-dimension 0. We perform this calculation in this section. This new deduction is useful for physical applications because allowing integration in a non-zero measure domain of the tangent space, a mayor freedom is available for physical states([4]).

Let $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ be a Finsler structure and consider the set of sub-manifolds of $\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$:

$$L(x,r,R) = \{y \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M} \mid \; r \leq F(x,y) \leq R,\, r \leq 1 \leq R\}.$$

The measure function $\psi(x,y)$ is defined by

$$\psi(x,y) = C(x,r,R) F^{-n}(x,y).$$

The function $C(x,r,R)$ defined over $\mathbf{M}$ is given by the normalization condition

$$\int_{L(x,r,R)} d^n y\, C(x,r,R)\, F^{-n}(x,y)=1.$$

$\{\psi(x,y),\ L(x,r,R)\}$ with r and R are positive constants is an *invariant measure*. It is a consequence of the horizontal invariance of the Finsler function F by parallel transport defined by the Chern connection (*Proposition* 4.1).

Let us introduce Finsler spherical coordinates for the tangent space $\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$ through the relations

$$y^j=\rho(x,y)f^j(\theta_k),\quad k=1,...,n-1,\quad j=1,...,n.$$

The functions $f^j(\theta_k)$ are polynomial functions on $sin\,\theta_k$ and $cos\,\theta_k$. $\rho(x,y)$ is the Finsler norm of the vector y at the point x. $\{f^j(\theta_k),\, j=1,...,n\}$ have the same form as the ones appearing in the definition of the relation of cartesian coordinates and spherical coordinates for $\mathbf{S}^{n-1}$. $\{\theta_1,...,\theta_{n-1}\}$ forms a local coordinate system for $\mathbf{I}_x$. This fact is a consequence of the existence of spherical coordinates on $\mathbf{S}^{n-1}$ and the positive condition of the Finsler structure: because $\mathbf{I}_x$ is a strictly convex, oriented sub-manifold of $\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}\setminus\{0\}$, we can project every point from $\mathbf{I}_x$ to $\mathbf{S}^{n-1}_x$ and this projection is a diffeomorphism; ρ is the scale factor of this projection, which is the value of the Finsler norm $F(x,y)$ and $(\theta_1,...,\theta_{n-1})$ are defined as the angular coordinates of the projection on the Euclidean sphere.

The relation between the invariant volume form $d^n y$ in local coordinates $(y^1,...,y^n)$ and in spherical coordinates is given through the definition of the spherical volume form $d\Omega$, that is a non-degenerate $(n-1)$-form defined by the formula:

$$d^n y=\sqrt{det\,g}\rho^{n-1}d\rho\wedge d\Omega. \tag{3.9}$$

$d\rho$ is such that $d\rho(e_n)=1$ for $e_n=\frac{y^k}{F(x,y)}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^k}$. $d\Omega$ depends on the angular coordinates $(\theta_1,...,\theta_{n-1})$ but not on the radial coordinate ρ; $d\Omega$ is the $(n-1)$-volume form induced from the canonical volume of the Riemannian manifold $(\mathbf{I}_x\mathbf{M},\tilde{g})$ considered as a Riemannian sub-manifold of $(\mathbf{N},g_N)$.

We can use spherical Finsler coordinates to calculate the above integral; due to the fact that $F(x,y)$ is positive homogeneous of degree 1 in the $(y^1,...,y^n)$ coordinates, the function $C(x,r,R)$ can be obtained in the following way:

$$\int_{L(x,r,R)} C(x,r,R)F^{-n}(x,y)\,d^n y=$$

$$=\int_{\mathbf{I}_x}\int_r^R d\rho\rho^{n-1}C(x,r,R)\rho^{-n}F^{-n}(x,\theta)\sqrt{det\,g}\,d\Omega;\ F^{-n}(x,\theta)=F^{-n}(x,y,\rho(y)).$$

Since F is homogeneous of degree 1 on y the determinant function $\sqrt{det\, g}$ is homogeneous of degree zero in ρ and then $\sqrt{det\, g} = \sqrt{det\, \tilde{g}}$,

$$\int_{\mathbf{I}_x} \int_r^R d\rho \rho^{-1} C(x,r,R) F^{-n}(x,\theta) \sqrt{det\, g}\, d\Omega =$$

$$= \frac{-1}{n} \big(\frac{1}{\frac{1}{R} - \frac{1}{r}} \big) C(x,r,R) \int_{\mathbf{I}_x} \sqrt{det\, \tilde{g}}\, d\Omega = 1$$

Therefore the value of the normalization constant is:

$$C(x,r,R) = \frac{-1}{n} \big(\frac{1}{\frac{1}{R} - \frac{1}{r}} \big) \int_{\mathbf{I}_x} \sqrt{det\, \tilde{g}}\, d\Omega.$$

From the above calculations it follows that we can define another Riemannian metric from the initial Finsler structure $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ in the following way:

Definition 3.12 *Let $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ be a Finsler structure and let $(x, \mathbf{U})$ be a local coordinate system on $\mathbf{M}$. Then $h(x,r,R)$ is defined in this local coordinate system by the set of component functions $\{h_{ij}(x,r,R),\ i,j = 1,...,n\}$ given by:*

$$h_{ij}(x,r,R) = \int_{L(x,r,R)} g_{ij}(x,y) C(x,r,R) F^{-n}(x,y)\, d^n y$$

and it is given by the formula

$$h(x,r,R) = h_{ij}(x,r,R)\, dx^i \otimes dx^j. \tag{3.10}$$

Let us calculate the components of the metric (3.10),

$$h_{ij} = \frac{1}{\frac{-1}{n}\big(\frac{1}{\frac{1}{R}-\frac{1}{r}}\big) \int_{\mathbf{I}_x} \sqrt{g} d\Omega} \int_{L(x,r,R)} g_{ij}(x, f^p(\theta^k)) \rho^{-n+1} F^{-n}(x, \frac{y}{F(x,y)}) \sqrt{g}\, d\Omega\, d\rho =$$

$$= \frac{1}{\frac{-1}{n}\big(\frac{1}{\frac{1}{R}-\frac{1}{r}}\big) \int_{\mathbf{I}_x} \sqrt{g} d\Omega} \Big(\int_{\mathbf{I}_x} g_{ij}(x, f^p(\theta^k)) \rho^{-n+1} F^{-n}(x, \frac{y}{F(x,y)}) \sqrt{g}\, d\Omega \Big) \int_r^R \rho^{-n+1}\, d\rho =$$

$$= \frac{1}{\int_{\mathbf{I}_x} \sqrt{g} d\Omega} \Big(\int_{\mathbf{I}_x} g_{ij}(x, f^p(\theta^k)) \rho^{-n+1} F^{-n}(x, \frac{y}{F(x,y)}) \sqrt{g}\, d\Omega \Big).$$

Proposition 3.13 *Let $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ be a Finsler structure. Then $h(x,r,R)$ is a Riemannian metric.*

Proof: It is analogous to the proof of *Proposition* 3.7; we check both, the tensorial character of the metric coefficients and that the matrix coefficients have the properties of a Riemannian metric coefficients. □

Proposition 3.14 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Finsler structure. Then the set of coefficients* $\{h_{ij}(x, r, R),\ i, j = 1, ..., n\}$ *are independent of* r *and* R.

Proof: The metric coefficients $h_{ij}(x, r, R)$ are directly calculated; we note the homogeneous dimension in the label ρ in the integrand:

1. F^{-n} is homogeneous of degree $-n$.
2. $d^n y$ is homogeneous of degree $n - 1$.
3. g_{ij} is homogeneous of degree zero.
4. $d\Omega$ is independent of ρ.
5. $det\,\tilde{g}$ is homogeneous of degree zero.

Then a short calculation implies

$$h_{ij}(x, r, R) = \frac{1}{\frac{-1}{n}\left(\frac{1}{\frac{1}{R} - \frac{1}{r}}\right) \int_{\mathbf{I}_x} \sqrt{det\,\tilde{g}}\, d\Omega} \int_{L(x,r,R)} \sqrt{det(\tilde{g})} g_{ij}(x, y) F^{-n}(x, y)\, d^n y =$$

$$= \frac{1}{\int_{\mathbf{I}_x} \sqrt{det\,\tilde{g}}\, d\Omega} \int_{\mathbf{I}_x} \sqrt{det\,\tilde{g}}\, g_{ij}(x, y)\, d\Omega.$$

This calculation shows that $h_{ij}(x, r, R)$ is independent of r and R. □

Proposition 3.14 implies that the metrics $h(x)$ and $h(x, r, R)$ are the same; if we take the limit $r \longrightarrow 1$ and $R \longrightarrow 1$ in $h_{ij}(x, r, R)$, because the coefficients $h_{ij}(x, r, R)$ do not depend on (r, R), the limit exists and it is equal to the constant value $h_{ij}(x)$ defined by eq. 3.5

Corollary 3.15 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Finsler structure and consider the metric structures* $h(x, r, R)$ *and* $h(R)$. *Then*

$$h(x, r, R) = h(x),\ \forall r \leq 1 \leq R \in \mathbf{R}^+. \tag{3.11}$$

We can check very easily that the Cartan tensor for $h(x, r, R)$ (and therefore for $h(x)$) is zero, in accordance with Deicke's theorem. The partial derivatives respect the spherical coordinates are zero because these coordinates are completely integrated; the derivative in the radial direction ρ is zero because the integrand is invariant under the global dilatation $y \longrightarrow \lambda y$, implying that $h(x) \longrightarrow h(x)$. This implies $\frac{\partial h_{ij}}{\partial \rho} = 0$. Since all the other partial derivatives are also zero in these local coordinates in $\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$, we can conclude that $A_{ijk} = 0$ in a natural coordinate system.

3.3 A coordinate-free formula for h

A geometric formula for the metric h described in the above section is presented. It is achieved using the canonical projections of the bundle $\pi^*\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(0,2)}\mathbf{M}$.

Let us consider the fiber metric, $g = g_{ij}(x,y)\pi^* dx^i \otimes \pi^* dx^j$, $\pi^* dx^i|_x = dx^i|_\xi$, $\xi \in \pi_2^{-1}(u)$ and $u \in \pi^{-1}(x)$.

Proposition 3.16 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Finsler structure. Then the following equation holds,*

$$h(x) := \frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)} \int_{\mathbf{I}_x} dvol\, \pi_2\, g \; =< \pi_2\, g \; >, \tag{3.12}$$

where g *is the fiber metric.*

Proof: For an arbitrary point $x \in \mathbf{M}$, $h(x) =< g_{ij} > \; dx^i|_x \otimes dx^j|_x$, $u \in \mathbf{I}_x$ and $S \in \mathbf{TM}$:

$$< \pi_2(g_{ij}(u)\, dx^i|_\xi \otimes dx^j \;|_\xi) >_u \; (S,S) =$$

$$=< g_{ij}\,(u) dx^i|_x \otimes dx^j|_x >=< g_{ij}(u) >_u \, dx^i|_x \otimes dx^j|_x(S,S) = h(x)(S,S).$$

This equality holds for arbitrary vector fields $S \in \mathbf{TM}$. □

The proof can be extended to any metric h obtained as an average from g. Then the following formula holds:

$$h_\psi(x,y) =< \pi_2\, g \; >_\psi \, .$$

it Proposition 3.16 is a consequence of the definition of the average $< \cdot >$ for general p-forms $\omega \in \pi^*\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(0,p)}\mathbf{M}$. This average is defined by the formula

$$< \omega > (X_1, ..., X_p) = \frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)} \int_{\mathbf{I}_x} dvol\, \pi_2|_u\, \omega(\pi^* X_1, ..., \pi^* X_p). \tag{3.13}$$

The next result can also be easily proved:

Proposition 3.17 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Finsler structure. Then the following properties hold:*

1. *$< \cdot >$ is a linear homomorphism between $\pi^*\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(0,q)}\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(0,q)}\mathbf{M}$.*
2. *Denote by $g_t = tg_1 + (1-t)g_2$ and suppose that $< g_1 >=< g_2 >= h$. Then $< g_t >= h$.*

A similar operation can be constructed acting on tensor fields of arbitrary order, producing an homomorphism between $\pi^*\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(p,q)}\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(p,q)}\mathbf{M}$.

Remark 3.18 $< \cdot >$ does not preserve the tensorial product. Suppose two Finsler structures $(\mathbf{M}, F_1)$ and $(\mathbf{M}, F_2)$ with fundamental tensors g_1 and g_2. Then $< g_1 \otimes g_2 > \neq < g_1 > \otimes < g_2 >$ due to the mixing produced in the definition of the new Finsler function F associated with g.

4 Average linear connections, their parallel transports and curvature endomorphisms

In this section a 1-parameter family of linear connections on $\mathbf{M}$ are defined as "average" of the initial Chern's connection, although the formalism can also be extended to any linear connection on the bundle $\pi^*\mathbf{TM} \longrightarrow \mathbf{N}$ (or on the bundles $\pi^*\mathbf{TM} \longrightarrow \mathbf{SM}$ or $\pi^*\mathbf{TM} \longrightarrow \mathbf{PTM}$). They are obtained as a generalization of *equation 3.12*. The averaged connections are affine connections on $\mathbf{M}$ and are torsion free (in case we average the Chern connection). Indeed we will consider 1-parameter families of connections, all them torsion free and linear connections on $\mathbf{M}$.

After this fundamental construction, we obtain the parallel transport and the associated curvature endomorphism in terms of the parallel transport and the *hh*-curvature of the Chern connection.

The notation used is the following: π^*, π_1, π_2 are the canonical projections of the pull-back bundle $\pi^*\mathbf{\Gamma M} \longrightarrow \mathbf{N}$, $\pi^*_u\mathbf{\Gamma M}$ denotes the fiber over $u \in \mathbf{N}$ of the bundle $\pi^*\mathbf{\Gamma M}$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma}_x\mathbf{M}$ is the set of tensors over $x \in \mathbf{M}$, being $S_x \in \mathbf{\Gamma}_x\mathbf{M}$ a generic element of $\mathbf{\Gamma}_x\mathbf{M}$. S_u denotes the evaluation of the section S of the bundle $\pi^*\mathbf{\Gamma M}$ at the point $u \in \mathbf{N}$.

4.1 The average linear connections of ∇

Let $\tilde{X}$ be a tangent vector field $\tilde{X}$ along the horizontal path $\tilde{\gamma} : [0,1] \longrightarrow \mathbf{N}$ connecting the points $u \in \mathbf{I}_x$ and $v \in \mathbf{I}_z$. The parallel transport associated with the Chern connection along $\tilde{\gamma}$ of a section $S \in \pi^*\mathbf{TM}$ is denoted by $\tau_{\tilde{\gamma}}S$. The parallel transport along $\tilde{\gamma}$ of the point $u \in \mathbf{I}_x$ is $\tau_{\tilde{\gamma}}(u) = \tilde{\gamma}(1) \in \pi^{-1}(z)$; the horizontal lift of a path is defined using the non-linear connection defined on the bundle $\mathbf{TN} \longrightarrow \mathbf{N}$.

Proposition 4.1 *(Invariance of the indicatrix by horizontal parallel transport) Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Finsler structure,* $\tilde{\gamma} : [0,1] \longrightarrow \mathbf{N}$ *the horizontal lift of the path* $\gamma : [0,1] \longrightarrow \mathbf{M}$ *joining* x *and* z. *Then the value of the function* $F(x,y)$ *is invariant. In particular, let us consider* $\mathbf{I}_x$ *(resp* $(\mathbf{I}_z)$*) is the indicatrix over* x *(resp* z*). Then* $\tau_{\tilde{\gamma}}(\mathbf{I}_x) = \mathbf{I}_z$.

Proof: Let $\tilde{X}$ be the horizontal lift in $\mathbf{TN}$ of the tangent vector field X along the path $\gamma \subset \mathbf{M}$ joining x and z, $S_1, S_2 \in \pi^*(\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M})$. Then *corollary* 2.5 implies $\nabla_{\tilde{X}}g(S_1, S_2) = 2A(\tilde{X}, S_1, S_2) = 0$ because the vector field $\tilde{X}$ is horizontal and the Cartan tensor is evaluated in the first argument. Therefore the value of the Finslerian norm $F(x,y) = \sqrt{g_{ij}(x,y)\, y^i\, y^j}$, $y \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$, Y

with $Y = \pi^* y$ is conserved by horizontal parallel transport,

$$\nabla_{\tilde{X}}(F^2(x,y)) = \nabla_{\tilde{X}}(g(x,y))(Y,Y) + 2g(x, \nabla_{\tilde{X}} Y) = 0,$$

being $\tilde{X} \in \mathbf{TN}$ an horizontal vector. The first term is zero because the above calculation. The second term is zero because of the definition of parallel transport of sections $\nabla_{\tilde{X}} Y = 0$. In particular the indicatrix $\mathbf{I}_x$ is mapped to $\mathbf{I}_z$ because parallel transport is a diffeomorphism. $\square$

This proposition implies that the set of sub-manifolds $\Delta = \{\mathbf{I}_x \subset \mathbf{N},\ x \in \mathbf{M}\}$ is an *invariant set of sub-manifolds* and that $F(x,y)$ is invariant by horizontal parallel transport in $\pi^*\mathbf{TM} \longrightarrow \mathbf{M}$ using the Chern connection.

We use the following isomorphisms in the construction of the average connection. Let us consider the fiber over $v \in \mathbf{N}$ $\pi_v^* \mathbf{\Gamma M}$ and the space of tensors over x that is the fiber $\mathbf{\Gamma}_x\mathbf{M}$; for every tensor $S_x \in \mathbf{\Gamma}_x\mathbf{M}$ and $v \in \pi^{-1}(z)$, $z \in \mathbf{U}$ we consider the homomorphism:

$$\pi_2|_v : \pi_v^* \mathbf{\Gamma M} \longrightarrow \mathbf{\Gamma}_z\mathbf{M}, \quad S_v \longrightarrow S_z$$

$$\pi_v^* : \mathbf{\Gamma}_z\mathbf{M} \longrightarrow \pi_v^* \mathbf{\Gamma M}, \quad S_z \longrightarrow \pi_v^* S_z.$$

Let $S \in \Gamma \pi^* \mathbf{TM}$ and $S(u) := S_u \in \pi^{-1}(u)$. Then, it holds that

$$\pi_u^* \, \pi_2|_v S(v) = S(u), \ u, v \in \pi^{-1}(x). \tag{4.1}$$

We can proof this expression in the following way: if $S(v) \in \Gamma_v \, \pi^* \Gamma M$, $S(u) \in \Gamma_u \, \pi^* \Gamma M$, we have that in a local frame $S(v) = \xi^J(x) \, \pi_v^* e_J|_x$ and respectively $S(u) = \xi^J(x) \, \pi_u^* e_J|_x$. Therefore we can calculate,

$$\pi_2|_v S(v) = \pi_2 \left(\xi^J(x) \, \pi_v^* e_J|_x \right) = \xi^J(x) \, e_J|_x.$$

Then

$$\pi_u^* \, \pi_2|_v S(v) = \pi_u^* \, \xi^J(x) \, e_J|_x \ = \xi^J(x) \, \pi_u^* e_J|_x = S(u).$$

Note that for arbitrary $u, v \in \pi^{-1}(x)$ and an arbitrary element $S_u \in \pi_u^* \mathbf{TM}$, in general is not true that

$$\pi_u^* \pi_2 \ |_v \colon \pi_v^* \mathbf{\Gamma M} \longrightarrow \pi_u^* \mathbf{\Gamma M}, \quad S_v \longrightarrow S_u$$

because $\pi_u^* \pi_2|_v S_v = \pi_u^* S_x$ and it is not the same than $S_u \in \pi_1^{-1}(u)$, the evaluation of the section $S \in \pi^* \Gamma M$ at the point u.

Definition 4.2 *Consider the family of operators* $A_w := \{A_w : \pi^*_w\mathbf{TM} \longrightarrow \pi^*_w\mathbf{TM}\}$ *with* $w \in \pi^{-1}(x)$. *The average of this family of operators is defined to be the operator* $A_x : \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M} \longrightarrow \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$ *with* $x \in \mathbf{M}$ *given by the action:*

$$< A_w \; > := < \pi_2|_u A\, \pi^*_u >_u S_x = \frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)}\Big(\int_{\mathbf{I}_x} \pi_2|_u A_u \pi^*_u \, dvol\Big) S_x,$$

$$u \in \pi^{-1}(x),\; S_x \in \mathbf{\Gamma}_x\mathbf{M}; \tag{4.2}$$

The volume form on dvol is the standard volume form induced from the indicatrix $\mathbf{I}_x$ *from the Riemannian volume of the Riemannian structure* $(\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M} - \{0\}, g_x)$.

We will use the following isomorphisms later (section 6). Let $\{\vartheta_w,\, w \in \pi^{-1}(z),\, z \in \mathbf{U}\}$ in the following way. Consider an arbitrary basis of $\pi^*_u\mathbf{TM}$ $\{e_\mu,\, \mu = 1, ..., n\}$. In this basis, the fundamental tensor g have an associated matrix with components $g_{\mu\nu}$ and the inverse matrix g^{-1} have components denoted by $g^{\mu\nu}$. The Riemannian metric h has components $h_{\mu\nu}$ and the corresponding inverse matrix have components $h^{\mu\nu}$. Using these matrices we define the family of isomorphisms:

$$\vartheta_w : \pi^*_w\mathbf{TM} \longrightarrow \pi^*_w\mathbf{TM},\; w \in \pi^{-1}(z), z \in \mathbf{U}.$$

$$e_\mu \longrightarrow g_{\mu\lambda}|_w[(\pi^*h)^{-1}]^{\lambda\rho} e_\rho, w \in \pi^{-1}(z).$$

The coefficients $[(\pi^*h)^{-1}]^{\lambda\rho} e_\rho$ are defined by the following formula:

$$(h^{-1})^{\mu\nu} = vol(\mathbf{I}_x)\Big(\big(\int_{\mathbf{I}_x} g\big)^{-1}\Big)^{\mu\nu},$$

where we have denoted by $\big(\int_{\mathbf{I}_x} g\big)$ the matrix with coefficients given by $(\int_{\mathbf{I}_x} g)_{\mu\nu} := \int_{\mathbf{I}_x} g_{\mu\nu},\; \mu\,\nu = 1, ..., n.$

ϑ_w is also linear and indeed it is an endomorphism for every $w \in \pi^{-1}(z)$ because both matrices g and h are invertible. It will be useful to consider a tensor of type $(1,1)$ associated with $\{\vartheta^\mu_\nu\}$, denoted also by ϑ.

We can generalize the ϑ operator to sections of arbitrary order in the following way. Let us consider the basis for sections of $\pi^*\mathbf{\Gamma M}$ obtained from $\{e_\mu,\, \mu = 1, ..., n\}$ by tensorial product $\{e_{\mu_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{\mu_p},\, \mu_1, ..., \mu_p = 1, ..., n\}$. Then we define the generalized ϑ_w operator,

$$\vartheta_w : \pi^*_w\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(p,0)}\mathbf{M} \longrightarrow \pi^*_w\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(p,0)}\mathbf{M}$$

$$e_{\mu_1} \otimes e_{\mu_2} \cdots \otimes e_{\mu_p} \longrightarrow \vartheta^{\rho_1}_{\mu_1} e_{\rho_1} \otimes \vartheta^{\rho_2}_{\mu_2} e_{\rho_2} \cdots \vartheta^{\rho_p}_{\mu_p} e_{\rho_p}.$$

For covariant tensors we use the same construction; let us consider the dual basis formed by $\{e^{\mu_1}\otimes\cdots\otimes e^{\mu_q},\ \mu_1,...,\mu_q = 1,...,n\}$, then we define the generalized ϑ_w operators by

$$\vartheta_w : \pi^*_w\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(q,0)}\mathbf{M} \longrightarrow \pi^*_w\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(q,0)}\mathbf{M}$$

$$e^{\mu_1}\otimes e^{\mu_2}\cdots\otimes e^{\mu_q} \longrightarrow \vartheta^{\mu_1}_{\rho_1}e^{\rho_1}\otimes\vartheta^{\mu_2}_{\rho_2}e^{\rho_2}\cdots\otimes\vartheta^{\mu_q}_{\rho_q}e^{\rho_q}.$$

Let $f\in\mathcal{F}\mathbf{M}$ be a real, smooth function on the manifold $\mathbf{M}$; $\pi^*f\in\pi^*\mathcal{F}\mathbf{M}$ is defined in the following way,

Definition 4.3 *Let $(\mathbf{M},F)$ be a Finsler structure, $\pi(u)=x$ and consider $f\in\mathcal{F}\mathbf{M}$. Then*

$$\pi^*_u f = f(x), \quad \forall u\in\pi^{-1}(x). \tag{4.3}$$

The definition is consistent because the function $\pi^*_v f$ is constant for every $v\in\pi^{-1}(x)$: $\pi^*_u f = f(x) = \pi^*_v f$, $\forall u,v\in\pi^{-1}(x)$. Therefore the image is the constant value $f(x)$ for every $w\in\pi^{-1}(x)$. $\pi^*_u : \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}\longrightarrow\pi^*_u\mathbf{TM}$ is an isomorphism between $\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$ and $\pi^{-1}_1(u)$, $\forall x\in\mathbf{M}$, $u\in\pi^{-1}(x)$.

Let us denote the horizontal lifting operator in the following way:

$$\iota : \mathbf{TM}\longrightarrow\mathbf{TN}, \quad X = X^i\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}|_x \longrightarrow \tilde{X} = X^i\frac{\delta}{\delta x^i}|_u = \iota(X),\ u\in\pi^{-1}(x). \tag{4.4}$$

This homomorphism is injective and the final result is a section of the tensor bundle $\mathbf{TN}$. In addition, it defines unambiguously a horizontal tangent vector $\tilde{X}\in\mathcal{H}_u$ for every tangent vector $X\in\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$. We will also consider the restrictions of this map $\{\iota_u,\ u\in\pi^{-1}(x)\}$ in our calculations, such that $\iota_u(X) = (\iota X)_u$, $X\in\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$.

The following *proposition* is one of the main results of the work,

Proposition 4.4 *Let $(\mathbf{M},F)$ be a Finsler structure and $u\in\pi^{-1}(x)$, with $x\in\mathbf{M}$ and let us consider its Chern connection ∇. Then for each tangent field $X\in\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$ there is defined on $\mathbf{M}$ a covariant derivative $\tilde{\nabla}_X$ determined by*

1. *$\forall X\in\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$ and $Y\in\mathbf{TM}$ the covariant derivative of Y in the direction X is given by the following average:*

$$\tilde{\nabla}_X Y = <\pi_2|_u\nabla_{\iota_u(X)}\pi^*_v Y>_u,\ u\in\mathbf{I}_x\subset\pi^{-1}(x)\subset\mathbf{N}. \tag{4.5}$$

2. *For every smooth function $f\in\mathcal{F}\mathbf{M}$ the covariant derivative is given by the following average:*

$$\tilde{\nabla}_X f = <\pi_2|_u\nabla_{\iota_u(X)}\pi^*_v f>_u . \tag{4.6}$$

Proof: The consistency of the equation (4.5) can be proved in the following way,

$$\tilde{\nabla}_X f =< \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u(X)} \pi_v^* f >_u =< \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u(X)} \pi_v^* f >_u =$$
$$=< \pi_2|_u \iota_u(X)(\pi_v^* f) >_u =< \pi_2|_u \pi_u^*(X(f)) >_u =< Xf >_u = Xf.$$

We use the constancy on $u \in \pi^{-1}(x)$ for a given $x \in \mathbf{M}$ and that Chern's connection is linear. In particular the second equality is because the definition of $\vartheta_w \pi_v^* f(z) = f(z)$, $\forall w, v \in \pi^{-1}(z)$, $\forall f \in \mathcal{F}\mathbf{M}$. The fourth equality is because the definition of the horizontal local basis $\{\frac{\delta}{\delta x^1}|_u, ..., \frac{\delta}{\delta x^n}|_u\}$ in terms of $\{\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}, \, i = 1, ..., n\}$ and $\{\frac{\partial}{\partial y^i}, \, i = 1, ..., n\}$.

We check the properties characterizing a linear covariant derivative for $\tilde{\nabla}$.

1. $\tilde{\nabla}_X$ is a linear application acting on vector sections of $\mathbf{TM}$:

$$\tilde{\nabla}_X (Y_1 + Y_2) = \tilde{\nabla}_X Y_1 + \tilde{\nabla}_X Y_2$$
$$\tilde{\nabla}_X \lambda Y = \lambda \tilde{\nabla}_X Y,$$
$$\forall \; Y_1, Y_2, Y \in \mathbf{\Gamma M}, \lambda \in \mathbf{R}, \quad X \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}. \tag{4.7}$$

For the first equation, the proof consists in the following calculation:

$$\tilde{\nabla}_X (Y_1 + Y_2) =< \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u(X)} \pi_v^*(Y_1 + Y_2) > =< \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u(X)} \pi_v^* Y_1 > +$$
$$+ < \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u(X)} \pi_v^* Y_2 >_v = \tilde{\nabla}_X Y_1 + \tilde{\nabla}_X Y_2.$$

For the second condition:

$$\tilde{\nabla}_X (\lambda Y) =< \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u(X)} \pi_v^*(\lambda Y) >_v = \lambda < \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u(X)} \pi_v^* Y > = \lambda \tilde{\nabla}_X Y.$$

2. $\tilde{\nabla}_X Y$ is a $\mathcal{F}$-linear respect X:

$$\tilde{\nabla}_{X_1 + X_2} Y = \tilde{\nabla}_{X_1} Y + \tilde{\nabla}_{X_2} Y,$$
$$\tilde{\nabla}_{fX}(Y) = f(x) \tilde{\nabla}_X Y,$$
$$\forall Y \in \mathbf{TM}, v \in \pi^{-1}(z), \quad X, X_1, X_2 \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}, \; f \in \mathcal{F}\mathbf{M}. \tag{4.8}$$

To prove the first equation it is enough the following calculation:

$$\tilde{\nabla}_{X_1 + X_2} Y =< \pi_2|_u (\nabla_{\iota_u(X_1 + X_2)}) \pi_v^* Y >_v =$$
$$=< \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u(X_1)} \pi_v^* Y >_v + < \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u(X_2)} \pi_v^* Y > =$$
$$= (\tilde{\nabla}_{X_1} Y) + (\tilde{\nabla}_{X_2} Y).$$

For the second condition the proof is similar.

3. The Leibnitz rule holds:

$$\tilde{\nabla}_X(fY) = df(X)Y + f\tilde{\nabla}_X Y, \quad \forall\ Y \in \mathbf{TM},\ f \in \mathcal{F}\mathbf{M}, \quad X \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}, \tag{4.9}$$

where $df(X)$ is the action of the 1-form $df \in \mathbf{\Lambda}^1_x\mathbf{M}$ on $X \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$ In order to prove (4.8) we use the following property:

$$\pi^*_v(fY) = \pi^*_v f \pi^*_v Y, \quad \forall\ Y \in \mathbf{TM},\ f \in \mathcal{F}\mathbf{M}.$$

Then,

$$\tilde{\nabla}_X(fY) =< \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u(X)} \pi^*_v(fY) >_u =< \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u(X)} \pi^*_v(f) \pi^*_v Y >_u =$$

$$=< \pi_2|_u (\nabla_{\iota_u(X)}(\pi^*_v f)) \pi^*_v(Y) >_u + < \pi_2|_u (\pi^*_u f) \nabla_{\iota_u(X)} \pi^*_v(Y) >_u =$$

$$=< \pi_2|_u (\iota_u(X)(\pi^*_v f)) \pi^*_v(Y) >_u + f_x < \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u(X)} \pi^*_v(Y) >_u =$$

$$=< (X_x f) \pi_2|_u \pi^*_u(Y) >_u + f_x < \pi_2|_v \nabla_{\iota_u(X)} \pi^*_v(Y) >_u .$$

For the first term we perform the following simplification,

$$< (Xf) \pi_2|_u \pi^*_u(Y) >_u = (Xf) < \pi_2|_u \pi^*_u(Y) >_u =$$

$$= (Xf)(< \pi_2|_u \pi^*_u >_u) Y = (Xf)(< \vartheta_u >_u) Y.$$

Using the basis $\{e_\mu\}$, we can write the above expression as

$$(< \vartheta_u >_u) Y =< g_{\mu\nu}(u) >_u \left((\pi^* h)^{-1}\right)^{\nu\rho} Y^\mu e_\rho =$$

$$= h_{\mu\nu}(u) \big((h)^{-1}\big)^{\nu\rho} Y^\mu e_\rho = Y^\mu e_\mu = Y.$$

Finally we obtain that

$$\tilde{\nabla}_X(fY) = \tilde{\nabla}_{X_x}(f) Y + f \tilde{\nabla}_X Y =$$

$$= df(X) Y + f \tilde{\nabla}_X Y.$$

□

The averaged covariant derivative commutes with contractions:

$$\tilde{\nabla}_X[\alpha(Z)] =< \pi_2|_u \theta_u \nabla_{\iota_u(X)} \pi^*(\alpha(Z)) >_u := \tilde{\nabla}_X(\iota_Z \alpha) = \iota_{\tilde{\nabla}_X(Z)} \alpha + \iota_Z \tilde{\nabla}_X \alpha.$$

The extension of the covariant derivative $\tilde{\nabla}_X$ acting on sections of $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(p,q)}\mathbf{M}$ is performed in the usual way,

$$\tilde{\nabla}_X\, K(X_1, ..., X_s, \alpha^1, ..., \alpha^r) = \tilde{\nabla}_X\, K(X_1, ..., X_s, \alpha^1, ..., \alpha^r) -$$

$$-\sum_{i=1}^{s} K(X_1,...,\tilde{\nabla}_X X_i,...,X_s,\alpha^1,...,\alpha^s)+\sum_{j=1}^{r} K(X_1,...,X_s,\alpha^1,...,\tilde{\nabla}_X\alpha^j,...\alpha^r).$$

From the proof of *Proposition* 4.4 one easily recognize that the result can be applied to any other linear connection defined in the bundle $\pi^*\mathbf{TM}$.

We denote the affine connection associated with the above covariant derivative by $\tilde{\nabla}$: for every section $Y\in\mathbf{TM}$, $\tilde{\nabla}Y\in\mathbf{T}^*_x\mathbf{M}\otimes\mathbf{TM}$, $x\in\mathbf{M}$ is given by the action on pairs $(X,Y)\in\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}\otimes\mathbf{TM}$,

$$\tilde{\nabla}(X,Y):=\tilde{\nabla}_X Y. \tag{4.10}$$

Let us calculate the torsion of the connection $\tilde{\nabla}$. At this point it is useful to consider ϑ_u as the value of a section of $\pi^*\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1,1)}\mathbf{M}$. Then the torsion is given for arbitrary vector fields $X,Y\in\mathbf{TM}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}T_{\tilde{\nabla}}(X,Y) &=< \pi_2|_u\nabla_{\iota_u(X)}\pi^*_w >_u Y- < \pi_2|_u\nabla_{\iota_u(Y)}\pi^*_w >_u X-[X,Y]=\\ &=< \pi_2|_u\nabla_{\iota_u(X)}\pi^*_u >_u Y- < \pi_2|_u\nabla_{\iota_u(Y)}\pi^*_u >_u X\\ &\quad - < \pi_2|_u\pi^*_u[X,Y] >=\\ &=< \pi_2|_u\big(\nabla_{\iota_u(X)}\pi^*Y-\nabla_{\iota_u(Y)}\pi^*X-\pi^*[X,Y]\big) >_u=0,\end{aligned}$$

because the torsion-free condition of the Chern connection (2.10). Therefore,

Proposition 4.5 *Let (*$\mathbf{M}$*,F) be a Finsler structure with averaged connection* $\tilde{\nabla}$*. Then the torsion* $T_{\tilde{\nabla}}$ *of the average connection obtained from the Chern connection is zero.*

Let us consider the following non-degenerate tensors,

$$g_t=(1-t)g+th,\; t\in[0,1].$$

g_t defines a Finsler structure in $\mathbf{M}$. The associated Chern's connection are denoted by ∇_t. Exactly as *Proposition 4.4* the following result is proved:

Theorem 4.6 *Let* $(\mathbf{M},F)$ *be a Finsler manifold and* $g_t=(1-t)g+th$, $t\in[0,1]$*. Then the operator*

$$\tilde{\nabla}_t=\frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)}\int_{\mathbf{I}_x}\pi_2|_u\nabla\pi^*_v \tag{4.11}$$

is a linear connection on $\mathbf{M}$ *with null torsion for every* $t\in[0,1]$*.*

4.2 Structural theorems

In this sub-section we present the relation between the parallel transport and curvature of the averaged connection $\tilde{\nabla}_1$ with the parallel transport and the hh-curvature R of the Chern connection. Although we state the theorems for the Chern connection, the main results are also valid for any linear connection on $\pi^*\mathbf{TM} \longrightarrow \mathbf{N}$. Following the discussion of the above sub-section, the associated parallel transports of the connection $\tilde{\nabla}_1$ are also obtained after an "average" of the parallel transport of the Chern connection.

The first result relates the parallel transport of the connection $\tilde{\nabla}$ with the parallel transport of the Chern connection ∇. We start considering the covariant derivative in terms of parallel transport ([3]); If $\mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathbf{N}$ is a vector bundle for a generic parallel transport τ along an arbitrary path x_t and with tangent vector $\dot{x}_t \in \mathbf{T}_u\mathbf{N}$, the covariant derivative of a section S is given by

$$\nabla_{\dot{x}_t} S = \lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{1}{\delta}\big(\tau_t^{t+\delta} S(x_{t+\delta}) - S(x_t)\big).$$

Let us apply this formula to the Chern connection and in particular in the definition of the connection $\tilde{\nabla}$,

$$\tilde{\nabla}_X S = < \pi_2|_u(t) \lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{1}{\delta}\big(\tau_t^{t+\delta} \pi^*_{u(t+\delta)} S(x_{t+\delta}) - \pi^*_{u(t)} S(x_t)\big) >_{u(t)},$$

with $u(t+\delta) \in \pi^{-1}(x(t+\delta))$. Interchanging the limit and the average operation,

$$\tilde{\nabla}_X S = \lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{1}{\delta} < \pi_2|_u \big(\tau_t^{t+\delta} \pi^*_{u(t+\delta)} S(x_{t+\delta}) - \pi^*_{u(t)} S(x_t)\big) >_{u(t)} .$$

This operation can be done because the integration is performed in $\mathbf{I}_x$, not depending therefore of the limit label δ. The evaluation of the second integral provides:

$$< \pi_2|_u \pi^*_{u(t)} S(x_t) >_{u(t)} = < \pi_2|_u \pi^*_{u(t)} S^\mu(x_t) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} >_{u(t)} =$$

$$= S^\mu(x_t) < \pi_2|_u \pi^*_{u(t)} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} >_{u(t)} = S^\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}.$$

Therefore we should consider the expression

$$< \pi_2|_u \tau_t^{t+\delta} \pi^*_{u(t+\delta)} >_u$$

as playing the role of the parallel transport operation for the average connection $\tilde{\nabla}$:

Theorem 4.7 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Finsler structure with associated Chern's connection* ∇ *and with average connection* $\tilde{\nabla}$*. Then the parallel transport associated with* $\tilde{\nabla}$ *is given by*

$$(\tilde{\tau}_t^{t+\delta})_{x_t} S := < \pi_2|_u \tau_t^{t+\delta} \pi^*_{u(t+\delta)} S(x_{t+\delta}) >_{u(t)}, \quad S_x \in \mathbf{\Gamma}_{x_t}\mathbf{M}. \tag{4.12}$$

Proof: It is immediate from the definition of the covariant derivative in terms of infinitesimal parallel transport; let us define the section along γ_t by

$$\tilde{\tau} S(x_{t+\delta}) = \tilde{\tau}^t_{t+\delta} S(x_t),$$

that is the parallel transported value of the section S from the point $x_{t+\delta}$ to the point x_t. Then it follows from the general definition of covariant derivative that

$$\tilde{\nabla}_X(\tilde{\tau} S) = \lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{1}{\delta} \big(\tilde{\tau}_t^{t+\delta} S(x_{t+\delta}) - S(x_t) \big) = 0.$$

When this condition is written in local coordinates, it is equivalent to a system of ODEs and the result is obtained from uniqueness and existence of solutions of ODEs. However, in order to check the consistency of this definition, we should check that the composition rule holds:

$$\tilde{\tau}_t^{t+\delta} \circ \tilde{\tau}_{t+\delta}^{t+2\delta} = \tilde{\tau}_t^{t+2\delta}.$$

The proof is directly obtained calculating the above composition. This calculation reveals the reason to take $\tilde{\nabla}_1$ as the average connection if one wants to preserve the rule of "average parallel transport as the parallel transport of the average connection" for finite paths:

$$\tilde{\tau}_t^{t+\delta} \circ \tilde{\tau}_{t+\delta}^{t+2\delta} = \frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_{u(t)})} \frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_{u(t+\delta)})} \int_{\mathbf{I}_{x_t}} \int_{\mathbf{I}_{x_{t+\delta}}} \pi_2|_{u(t)} \tau_t^{t+\delta} \pi^*_{u(t+\delta)} \pi_2|_{u(t+\delta)} \circ$$

$$\tau_{t+\delta}^{t+2\delta} \pi^*_{u(t+2\delta)} = \frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_{u(t)})} \frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_{u(t+\delta)})} \int_{\mathbf{I}_{x_t}} \int_{\mathbf{I}_{x_{t+\delta}}} \pi_2|_{u(t)} \tau_t^{t+\delta} \circ \tau_{t+\delta}^{t+2\delta} \pi^*_{u(t+2\delta)} =$$

$$\frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_{u(t)})} \int_{\mathbf{I}_{x_t}} \pi_2|_{u(t)} \tau_t^{t+2\delta} \pi^*_{u(t+2\delta)} = \tilde{\tau}_t^{t+2\delta}.$$

□

The next result shows the relation between the hh-curvature endomorphisms of the Chern connection ∇ and the curvature endomorphisms of the connection $\tilde{\nabla}$. We use a formula in order to express curvature endomorphisms as an infinitesimal parallel transport ([1]): denote by $\gamma_t : [0, 1] \longrightarrow \mathbf{M}$

the infinitesimal parallelogram built up from the vectors $X, Y \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$ with lengths equal to δt constructed using parallel transport along the integral curves of $X, Y, -X, -Y$ through a short time δt. Then for every linear connection, the curvature endomorphisms are given by the formula

$$\Omega(X,Y) = -\frac{d\tau(\gamma_t)}{dt}|_{t=0}. \tag{4.13}$$

It can be written formally like

$$I + \delta t\Omega(X,Y) = -\tau_{d\tilde{\gamma}}. \tag{4.14}$$

This equation must be understood as an equality modulo second order terms in δt, disregarding higher order terms on dt in the development of parallel transport as a smooth function of δt.

Let us denote by $\tilde{\Omega} = \tilde{R} := R^{\tilde{\nabla}}$ the curvature of $\tilde{\nabla}$ and let us recall the hh-curvature of the Chern connection (2.13),

Theorem 4.8 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Finsler structure. Let* $\iota(X_1), \iota(X_2)$ *be the horizontal lifts in* $\mathbf{T}_u\mathbf{N}$ *of the linear independent vectors* $X_1, X_2 \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$. *Then for every section* $Y \in \mathbf{\Gamma M}$*,*

$$\tilde{R}_x(X_1,X_2)Y =< \pi_2 R_u(\iota_u(X_1), \iota_u(X_2))\pi^*_u Y >_u,\ u \in \mathbf{I}_x \subset \pi^{-1} \subset \mathbf{N}. \tag{4.15}$$

Proof based on the definition of the curvature as parallel transport. The proof is based on the formula (4.13) for the value of the curvature endomorphism in terms of parallel transport and on *Theorem* 4.7. Let $d\gamma$ and $d\tilde{\gamma}$ be the infinitesimal parallelogram defined by the vectors $X_1, X_2 \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$ and denote the corresponding horizontal lifts $\tilde{X}_1$ and $\tilde{X}_2$ respectively. The following relation holds,

$$I + dt\tilde{R}_x = \tilde{\tau}_{d\gamma}, \quad I + \delta t R = dt\tau_{d\tilde{\gamma}},$$

where $\tilde{R}_x$ is the value of the curvature at x and R_u the value of the *hh*-curvature at $u \in \pi^{-1}(x)$. Now we perform a short calculation,

$$\delta t\tilde{R}_{d\gamma} = -\tilde{\tau}_{d\gamma} - I = - < \pi_2|_u \delta t \tau_{d\tilde{\gamma}_u}\pi^*_u >_u -I =$$

$$= - < \pi_2|_u(\tau_{d\tilde{\gamma}_u} + I)\pi^*_u >=< \pi_2|_u R_{d\tilde{\gamma}_u}\pi^*_u >_u .$$

□

Since $R_{d\tilde{\gamma}_u}$ is by definition $R_u(\iota_u(X_1), \iota_u(X_2))$, *equation* (4.15) is proved. This proof is based on the uniqueness of solutions of ordinary differential equations and the conclusion holds for any differentiable measure $\psi(x, y)$.

An Algebraic Proof of *Theorem 4.8***.** Let us assume a local frame, we can write the value of the averaged curvature endomorphism as

$$\tilde{R}_u(X,Y)Z =< \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u(X)} \pi^*|_u \cdot < \pi_2|_v \nabla_{\iota_v(Y)} \pi^*|_v Z >> -$$

$$- < \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u(Y)} \pi^*|_u \cdot < \pi_2|_v \nabla_{\iota_v(X)} \pi^*|_v Z >> -$$

$$- < \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u([X,Y])} \pi^*|_u Z >, \;\; X, Y, Z \in \Gamma\mathbf{TM}.$$

Using the relation (4.1) one can reduces the double integral to a single integral. For instance,

$$< \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u(X)} \pi^*|_u \cdot < \pi_2|_v \nabla_{\iota_v(Y)} \pi^*|_v Z >>=< \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u(X)} \nabla_{\iota_v(Y)} \pi^*|_u Z > .$$

Therefore,

$$\tilde{R}_u(X,Y)Z \;=< \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u(X)} \nabla_{\iota_v(Y)} \pi^*|_u Z > \; - < \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u(Y)} \nabla_{\iota_v(X)} \pi^*|_u Z > -$$

$$- < \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u([X,Y])} \pi^*|_u Z >=< \pi_2|_u R_u([X,Y]) \pi^*|_u Z >:=< R >_x (X,Y)Z.$$

□

This proof is based on the special type of distribution function that we have selected, that is $\psi(x, y) =$ *constante* on the indicatrix $\mathbf{I}_x$.

From this second proof one can think that given two averaged objects, if we multiply them, the product of averages is the average of the product. However this is not true, as the following example shows,

Example 4.9

$$\tilde{\nabla} < g >=< \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u X} \pi^*_u < \pi_2|_v g_{ij}(x,v) \pi^*_v e^i \otimes \pi^*_v e^j >>$$

$$\neq< \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\iota_u X} g_{ij}(x,u) \pi^*_v e^i \otimes \pi^*_u e^j >>,$$

because the coefficients g_{ij} live on $\mathbf{I}_x$ and not on $\mathbf{M}$. That makes that $\nabla_{\iota_u} g_{ij}(x, v) \neq 0$. The way it is different than zero is related with the vertical parallel transport of the metric, which involves the Cartan tensor.

In particular, this result means that the averaged connection is in general non-metrizable by the averaged metric structure $< g >$. Therefore, for invariant Cartan tensors under covariant derivative along horizontal directions, the metric ¡g¿ is preserved by the averaged covariant derivative of the Chern connection $< \nabla >$. This spaces are Berwald spaces.

4.3 New Isometric Invariants

In the above proofs we didn't use any statement concerning the Chern's connection. While the first proof of theorem 4.8 uses in a fundamental way existence and uniqueness of solutions of ordinary differential equations, the second proof makes use only of linearity and property 4.1. Therefore, it is expected that this reduction on the number of integrals happens for similar products of averaged operators, although not always it is the case as example 4.9 shows.

We can define the averaged hv-curvature. Let us denote the vertical lifting of $X = X^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$ by $\kappa(X) = X^i \frac{\partial}{\partial y^i}$. The averaged hv-curvature in the directions (X_1) and (X_2) is the endomorphism:

$$\tilde{P}_x(X_1, X_2) : \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M} \longrightarrow \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$$

$$Y \longrightarrow \tilde{P}_x(X_1, X_2)\, Y \; =< \pi_2 P_u(\iota_u(X_1), \kappa_u(X_2))\pi_u^* Y >_u, \quad u \in \mathbf{I}_x \subset \pi^{-1}(x) \subset \mathbf{N}. \tag{4.16}$$

Proposition 4.10 *The averaged hv-curvature operators are given by the formal curvature endomorphism:*

$$\tilde{P}_x(X_1, X_2)Y =< \pi_2|_v \nabla_{\iota_v(X_1)}\, \pi^*|_v \; < \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\kappa_u(X_2)}\pi_u^* Y >> -$$

$$- < \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\kappa_u(X_2)}\pi_u^* \; < \pi_2|_v \nabla_{\iota_v(X_1)}\, \pi^*|_v Y >> - < \pi_2|_v \nabla_{[\iota_v(X_1), \kappa_v(X_2)]}\, \pi^*|_v Y >$$

Proof: it is formally the same than the proof of *theorem 4.8.* □

Similarly, for the vv-curvature in the case of an arbitrary linear connection on $\pi^*\mathbf{TM}$, we define the averaged homomorphisms

$$\tilde{Q}_x(X_1, X_2) : \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M} \longrightarrow \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$$

$$Y \longrightarrow \tilde{Q}_x(X_1, X_2)\, Y \; =< \pi_2 Q_u(\kappa_u(X_1), \kappa_u(X_2))\pi_v^* Y >_u, \quad u \in \mathbf{I}_x \subset \pi^{-1}(x) \subset \mathbf{N}, \tag{4.17}$$

Proposition 4.11 *The averaged vv-curvature operators are given by the formal curvature endomorphism:*

$$\tilde{Q}_x(X_1, X_2)Y =< \pi_2|_v \nabla_{\kappa_v(X_1)}\, \pi^*|_v \; < \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\kappa_u(X_2)}\pi_u^* Y >> -$$

$$- < \pi_2|_u \nabla_{\kappa_u(X_2)}\pi_u^* \; < \pi_2|_v \nabla_{\kappa_v(X_1)}\, \pi^*|_v Y >> - < \pi_2|_v \nabla_{[\kappa_v(X_1), \kappa_v(X_2)]}\, \pi^*|_v Y > .$$

Proof: it is formally the same than the proof of *theorem 4.8.* □

The averaged endomorphisms (4.16) and (4.17) are living on the manifold $\mathbf{M}$. In the case of Riemannian geometry, they are both zero.

There are several notions of isometries in Finsler geometry. Given two Finsler structures $(\mathbf{M}, F_1)$ and $(\mathbf{M}, F_2)$ we say that they are fiber isometric iff there is a bundle morphism

$$\begin{tikzcd} \pi^*\mathbf{TM} \arrow[r, "\tilde{\phi}"] \arrow[d, "\pi"'] & \pi^*\mathbf{TM} \arrow[d, "\pi"] \\ \mathbf{N} \arrow[r, "\phi"] & \mathbf{N} \end{tikzcd}$$

that preserves the fiber metric, $\tilde{\phi}^*\pi^*g = \pi^*g$ and that is a bundle isomorphism, where $\tilde{\phi}^*\pi^*g$ is the pull-back of the fiber metric. A base Finsler isometry is a map $\Phi : \mathbf{M} \longrightarrow \mathbf{M}$ such that preserves the Finsler function, $F_2(x,y) = \phi \circ F_1(x,y)$. The second statement is equivalent to the preservation of a norm by a diffeomorphism of the base manifold.

Cartan and Chern connections are invariant under base manifold Finsler isometries, because the connections are defined in terms of F and its derivatives. This implies that, if the measure used in the definition of the averaged is invariant as well, then $\tilde{P}(X_1, X_2)$ and $\tilde{Q}(X_1, X_2)$. They are new invariants, living on the manifold $\mathbf{M}$.

This fact can be used to define new global invariants on manifolds. This invariants are basically defined as

$$\mathcal{I} = \int_{\mathbf{M}} d\mu\, \mathcal{F}(\tilde{Q}, \tilde{P}, F, g); \tag{4.18}$$

$\mathcal{F}(\tilde{Q}, \tilde{P}, F, g)$ is a scalar function and the volume form $d\mu$ is the volume form associated to the averaged metric $< g >$. Therefore the integral is invariant under the intersection of the group of global fiber isometries and the group of global base isometries.

Additionally, the averaged curvatures $\tilde{P}$ and $\tilde{Q}$ could be interesting in some applications in Physics, specially in gauge theory. A natural generalization of the notion of field refers to the case where the fields do not leave on the space-time manifold but on the indicatrix or a sphere bundle. In this case, the averaged description could be promoted as a phenomenological description. In this case, the symmetries of the more fundamental theory must constrain the averaged variables.

4.4 Relation between the Holonomy representation of ∇ and $\tilde{\nabla}$

Since the averaging operation produces a homomorphism between the set of parallel transports induced by ∇ and by $\tilde{\nabla}$, there is an induced homomorphism between holonomy groups:

$$
\begin{gathered}
<\cdot>: Hol(\nabla) \longrightarrow Hol(\tilde{\nabla}). \\
\tau_\gamma \pi^* S \longrightarrow < \pi_2 \tau_\gamma \pi^* S >, \\
\tau_\gamma \in Hol(\nabla).
\end{gathered} \tag{4.19}
$$

This homomorphism holds for any linear connection on $\pi^*\mathbf{TM}$.

Proposition 4.12 *From homomorphism* 4.19*, we have that* $Hol(\nabla) \supset Hol(\tilde{\nabla})$.

The homomorphism (4.19) is continuous because the operations involved are all continuous. Therefore we have the following

Proposition 4.13 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Finsler structure with compact holonomy group* $Hol(\nabla)$*. Then the averaged connection has compact holonomy group* $Hol(\tilde{\nabla})$*.*

Proof: Since the homomorphism $<\cdot>: Hol(\nabla) \longrightarrow Hol(\tilde{\nabla})$ is continuous and $Hol(\nabla)$ compact, $< Hol(\nabla) > := \{< \tau > \;\; \tau \in Hol(\nabla)\}$ is also compact. However, given a loop $\gamma \subset \mathbf{M}$, the average holonomy element associated is $\tilde{\tau}_\gamma = < \pi_2 \tau_{\tilde{\gamma}_u} \pi^*_u >$, where $\tilde{\gamma}_u$ is the horizontal lift of γ starting at u. Therefore $Hol(\tilde{\nabla}) = < Hol(\nabla) >$. This implies that $Hol(\tilde{\nabla})$ is compact, since all the operations involved are continuous. □

The important point is that there is a classification of irreducible torsion free affine holonomies ([20]). Even if in this general frame-work there is not a general de Rham decomposition theorem, the classification of holonomies is important in the clarification of some problems in Finsler Geometry.

5 Metric compatible with averaged connection and application to geodesic equivalence in Berwald manifolds

It is interesting to consider when the averaged connection of the Chern connection is Riemann metrizable, that is, when there is a Riemannian metric $\tilde{h}$ such that $\tilde{\nabla} = \nabla^{\tilde{h}}$. In this direction we obtain the following result,

Proposition 5.1 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Finsler structure. Then the averaged connection* $\tilde{\nabla}$ *of the Chern connection* $\tilde{\nabla}$ *is a metric irreducible connection iff the Holonomy group* $Hol(\tilde{\nabla})$ *is a Berger group.*

Proof: Suppose that $\tilde{\nabla}$ is metrizable. Then exist a Riemanian metric such that $\tilde{\nabla} = \nabla^{\tilde{h}}$, that is, the Levi-Civita connection of h. Since the torsion $T_{\tilde{\nabla}} = 0$, it implies $\tilde{\nabla}$ is a Riemannian connection and therefore in the case of irreducible metrics, the holonomy group $\tilde{\nabla}$ is a Berger group.

Conversely, let us suppose that $Hol(\tilde{\nabla})$ is an irreducible Berger group. Then it is compact. Then we can define the operation:

$$\int_{Hol(\tilde{\nabla})} d\tau; \qquad \tau \in Hol(\tilde{\nabla}).$$

$d\tau$ is an invariant Haar measure in $Hol(\tilde{\nabla})$. In particular we can use the Szabo construction in [8] to define the following scalar product in $\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$:

$$\tilde{h}_x(X, Y) = \int_{Hol(\tilde{\nabla})} (\tau * X, \tau^* Y)^* \, d\tau; \;\; X, Y \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}. \tag{5.1}$$

$(,)^*$ is an arbitrary scalar product on $\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$. One extends this scalar product to the whole manifold using the holonomy group, defining a Riemannian metric $\tilde{h}$ that is conserved by $\tilde{\nabla}$. □

There is a similar result for the averaged of the Cartan connection, although since it has in general torsion, it is Riemann metrizable but is not the Levi-Civita connection of a Riemannian metric.

It is natural to ask for the relation between the averaged metric $h := < g >$ and the metric (5.1) $\tilde{h}$. In order to clarify partially this point, let us consider the Szabo construction but using as initial scalar product at $\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$ the one defined by the Riemannian metric h, $h_x(X, Y) := h(x)(X, Y)$. We use geodesic rigidity to obtain a partial answer:

Definition 5.2 *Two Riemannian metrics h and $\bar{h}$ living on the manifold* $\mathbf{M}$ *with* $dim(\mathbf{M}) \geq 2$ *are geodesically equivalent if their of un-parameterized geodesics coincide.*

The manifold $\mathbf{M}$ *is called geodesically rigid if every two geodesically equivalent metrics are proportional.*

The work of Matveev contains the solution for geodesically rigidity in Riemannian manifolds (see for instance ref. [13], [14] and [16]).

Theorem 5.3 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Finsler structure such that* $\mathbf{M}$ *is Riemannian geodesically rigid, with the function* $vol(\mathbf{I}_x)$ *is constant and* $Hol(\tilde{\nabla})$ *is a Berger group. Then* $h = C\tilde{h}$.

In particular, for hyperbolic manifolds, being Riemannian geodesically rigid, one obtains

Corollary 5.4 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Finsler structure such that* $\mathbf{M}$ *is a closed manifold and such that* $\tilde{h}$ *is an hyperbolic metric with* $vol(\mathbf{I}_x)$ *constant and such that* $Hol(\tilde{\nabla})$ *is a Berger group. Then* $h = C\tilde{h}$.

One has to find examples where above *corollary* is applicable. Consider the category of Berwald spaces ([2]),

Definition 5.5 *A Finsler structure* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *is a Berwald space if there is a coordinate system where the coefficients of the Chern connection only depends on the manifold* $\mathbf{M}$.

For a Berwald space the volume function $vol(\mathbf{I}_x)$ is constant and the Holonomy group $Hol(\nabla)$ is compact too. The the averaged Holonomy group $Hol(\tilde{\nabla})$ is also compact and is a Berger group. Therefore it is a direct consequence from a theorem of Matveev ([16]),

Corollary 5.6 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Berwald structure such that* $\mathbf{M}$ *admits an hyperbolic Riemannian metric. Then* $h = \tilde{h}$ *and* $\tilde{\nabla} h = 0$.

In Finsler geometry, the metric is in general not reversible. Therefore it has sense the notion of geodesic reversibility. Consider the following piece-wise differentiable curve $\gamma \cup \beta$ where $\gamma(s)$, $s \in [0, s_0]$ is a geodesic of the Chern connection and β is a geodesic but that start at the end of γ and has reverted initial vector. Let us close with another curve that is simple Δ the above curve. We call it closed almost-geodesic triangle.

Definition 5.7 *We say that the structure* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *is geodesically reversible if every almost-geodesic triangle is retractible. Otherwise is geodesic irreversible.*

Examples of geodesically reversible structure are Riemannian manifolds and reversible Finsler manifolds. A non-trivial example is provided by Berwald structures. Since the averaged connection of the Chern or Cartan connection are coincide in the Berwald category and they are metric-free and they live on $\mathbf{M}$,

Proposition 5.8 *Let* $\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Berwald structure. Then,*

1. *It is geodesically rigid if the Szabo metric is Riemannian geodesically equivalent. In this case, there is a Riemannian metric with the same geodesics.*
2. *It is geodesically reversible.*

A similar result is obtained by $Matveev$ (*theorem 1* of [17]).

6 Bonnet-Gauss Theorem for Berwald Spaces

There is considerable literature on the problem to obtain a close generalization of the classical Gauss-Bonnet theorem in Finsler geometry ([18]). The original theorem can be stated in several ways. Here we obtain a generalization to the case of Berwald spaces such that:

1. It reduces to in the Riemannian case to the standard Gauss-Bonnet-Chern theorem.
2. It is obtained using a homotopy from the Riemannian case. Therefore the topological content is the same.

The Riemannian theorem that we want to generalize is ([19]). First let us define the following n-form, for a $2n$-manifold,

$$\Omega = (-1)^{n-1}\frac{1}{2^{2n}\pi^n n!}\epsilon_{i_1....i_{2n}}\Omega_{i_1 i_2}\wedge ... \wedge \Omega_{i_{2n-1}i_{2n}}.$$

Then, the formula of Gauss-Bonnet in the n-dimensional case is

$$\int_M \Omega = \aleph(\mathbf{M}),$$

being $\aleph(\mathbf{M})$ the Euler-characteristic of the manifold.

For a Berwald manifold, we introduce the following n-form,

$$\Omega_t := -\frac{1}{n!}\sum_{i_1\cdots i_n}\epsilon_{i_1 i_2\cdots i_{2n}} g^t_{i_1 j_1}(u_1)\cdots g^t_{i_n j_n}(u_n)\, {}^t\Omega^{j_1}_{i_2}(v_1)\wedge\cdots\wedge {}^t\Omega^{j_{2n-1}}_{j_n}(v_n).$$

In this product, each of the endomorphism ${}^t\Omega^{j_1}_{i_2}(v_1)$ is an horizontal endomorphism and it is constructed from the metric of g_t. For Berwald spaces, the endomorphism side does not depend on the vectors v, therefore

$$\Omega_t := -\frac{1}{n!}\sum_{i_1\cdots i_n}\epsilon_{i_1 i_2\cdots i_{2n}} g^t_{i_1 j_1}(u_1)\cdots g^t_{i_n j_n}(u_n) {}^t\Omega^{j_1}_{i_2}\wedge\cdots\wedge {}^t\Omega^{j_{2n-1}}_{j_n}.$$

Then, the average of the product is the product of the averaged, using a invariant measure:

$$< \Omega_t >:= -\frac{1}{n!}\sum_{i_1\cdots i_n}\epsilon_{i_1 i_2\cdots i_{2n}} h^t_{i_1 j_1}(u_1)\cdots h^t_{i_n j_n}(u_n) {}^t\Omega^{j_1}_{i_2}\wedge\cdots\wedge {}^t\Omega^{j_{2n-1}}_{j_n}.$$

Then we can define a 1-parameter family of integrals,

$$\int_{\mathbf{M}} < \Omega_t > .$$

The claim is that for each of these integrands, there is a Riemannian metric such that it corresponds to the total curvature of each of the metrics. This is true for Berwald metrics. If it is not true, we can take out the non-Riemannian part,

$${}^{t}\bar{\Omega}^{j_1}_{i_2} := {}^{t}\Omega^{j_1}_{i_2} - \{\text{not Riemannian part}\}.$$

And therefore, we can put formally the expression

$$\bar{\Omega}_t := \Omega_t - \Pi_t.$$

Therefore one can write

$$\int_{\mathbf{M}} \bar{\Omega}_t = \int_{bfM} \Omega_t - \Pi_t = \aleph(\mathbf{M}).$$

This is our general Gauss-Bonnet Chern formula. In the case of geodesically rigid manifolds, we can say more. For instance,

Theorem 6.1 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *a Berwald structure such that and* $\mathbf{M}$ *admits an hyperbolic, closed Riemannian metric. Consider a vector field* V *on* $\mathbf{M}$ *with isolate singularities. Let us consider the induced pull-back function* V^**. Then,*

$$\aleph(\mathbf{M}) = \int_{\mathbf{SM}} V^* K(h, \nabla). \tag{6.1}$$

It is clear that the requirement to be hyperbolic and closed is in this contest technical. It is possible to obtain similar statements under other geodesically rigidity conditions.

7 On a Rigidity Theorem for Landsberg Spaces

In this section, given an arbitrary Finsler structure $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ we calculate the Christoffel symbols for the Levi-Civita connection ∇^h of the averaged Riemannian metric h.

We apply the general formula for the value of the coefficients of the Levi-Civita connection of h when the initial Finsler structure $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ is a Landsberg space. We take as definition of Landsberg space the following,

Definition 7.1 *A Finsler structure* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *is a Landsberg space if the hv-curvature* P *is such that* $P^n_{ijk} = 0$*, in a basis where* $e_n = ([y], \frac{y}{F(y)})$.

Every Berwald space or a locally Minkowski space is a Landsberg space. The converse, the possible existence of Landsberg spaces that are not Berwald or locally Minkowski is still an openproblem in Finsler geometry.

An application of the formula for the Levi-Civita connection coefficients of the averaged metric h to the case of Landsberg spaces implies the following rigidity result. First we introduce the Riemannian sphere $\mathbf{S}^n(x) := \{y \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}; h(x,y) = 1\}$. Then the theorem is stated in the following way,

Theorem 7.2 *Given a Landsberg space* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *such that:*

1. F^2 *is* $\mathcal{C}^4$ *on* $\mathbf{N}$,
2. *The spheres* $(\mathbf{S^n}_x, \tilde{g})$ *are all isometric,* $\forall x \in \mathbf{M}$,
3. $F^2(x,y,t) \neq F^2(x,y,0)$ *for the intermediate Finsler structures* $(\mathbf{M}, F_t)$ *with* $t \in [0,1]$.

Then the Landsberg structure $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *is a Berwald or a locally Minkowski space.*

We remark that *Theorem 7.2* is obtained using a "philosophy" based on a property we call convex invariance: not only $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ but all the intermediate structures $(\mathbf{M}, F_t)$, being the Finsler function corresponding to the fundamental tensor g_t, have the same Riemannian average $(\mathbf{M}, h)$. This fact together with the invariance under translations in the parameter t of some properties of the initial Finsler structure are essential in the proof of rigidity results like the one presented in this section.

7.1 The coefficients of the Levi-Civita connection ∇^h

We should calculate the following Christoffel symbols:

$$\Gamma^k_{ij}(x) = \frac{1}{2}h^{kl}\big(\frac{\partial h_{lj}}{\partial x^i} + \frac{\partial h_{il}}{\partial x^j} - \frac{\partial h_{ij}}{\partial x^l}\big),\ i,j,k = 1,...,n. \tag{7.1}$$

The definition of the metric coefficients h_{lj} we use is:

$$h_{lj}(x) = \frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)}\int_{\mathbf{I}_x} g_{lj}\sqrt{det\tilde{g}}\,d\Omega =$$

$$= \frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)}\int_{\mathbf{I}_x} g_{lj}\sqrt{det\tilde{g}}\sum_k y^k(-1)^{(k-1)}dy^1\wedge\cdots\wedge dy^{k-1}\wedge dy^{k+1}\wedge\cdots\wedge dy^n.$$

Therefore we should make the following type of calculations:

$$\frac{\partial h_{lj}}{\partial x^i} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\Big(\frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)}\int_{\mathbf{I}_x} g_{lj}\sqrt{det\tilde{g}}\sum_k y^k(-1)^{(k-1)}dy^1\wedge\cdots\wedge dy^{k-1}\wedge$$

$$\wedge\, dy^{k+1}\wedge\ \cdots\ \wedge\ dy^n\Big) =$$

$$= \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\Big(\frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)}\Big)\int_{\mathbf{I}_x} g_{lj}\sqrt{det\tilde{g}}\sum_k y^k(-1)^{(k-1)}dy^1\wedge\cdots\wedge dy^{k-1}\wedge dy^{k+1}\wedge\cdots\wedge dy^n +$$

$$+\frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\Big(\int_{\mathbf{I}_x} g_{lj}\sqrt{det\tilde{g}}\sum_k y^k(-1)^{(k-1)}dy^1\wedge\cdots\wedge dy^{k-1}\wedge dy^{k+1}\wedge\cdots\wedge dy^n\Big).$$

The first derivative is basically calculated in [9](a different notion of the tensor Cartan is used in this context: instead of ours, the Cartan tensor used in [9] is completely horizontal). The Cartan tensor has horizontal covariant derivative along $\frac{\delta}{\delta x^s}$ denoted by $A_{ijk|s}$. One of these components have an special importance in Finsler theory; we choose an orthonormal frame of the fiber $\pi_2^{-1}(u)\subset\pi^*\mathbf{TM}$ such that $e_n = \frac{y^k}{F}\pi^*\frac{\partial}{\partial x^k}$. Then let us denote by

$$\dot{A}_{ijk} := A_{ijk|n}$$

and also we introduce

$$tr\,\dot{A} = \dot{A}^{ik}_i e_k,$$

where the matrix g^{-1} was used in raising indices.

Theorem 7.3 *(Bao-Shen, [9]) Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Finsler manifold and consider the volume function of the unit tangent spheres* $vol(\mathbf{I}_x)$. *Then for any vector field* $b^r \frac{\partial}{\partial x^r}$ *on* $\mathbf{M}$ *the following formula holds:*

$$b^r \frac{\partial vol(\mathbf{I}_x)}{\partial x^r} = -\int_{(\mathbf{I}_x, \tilde{g})} g(tr\, \dot{A}, b^r \frac{\partial}{\partial x^r}) \tag{7.2}$$

In particular:

$$tr\, \dot{A} = 0 \Longrightarrow vol(\mathbf{I}_x) \textit{ is constant.} \tag{7.3}$$

Therefore in our calculation we obtain:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\Big(\frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)}\Big) = -\frac{1}{vol^2(\mathbf{I}_x)} \frac{\partial vol(\mathbf{I}_x)}{\partial x^i} = \frac{1}{vol^2(\mathbf{I}_x)} \int_{(\mathbf{I}_x, \tilde{g})} g(tr\, \dot{A}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}),$$

and by the definition of the average $< \cdot >$ of functions,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\Big(\frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)}\Big) = \frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)} \; < g(tr\, \dot{A}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}) > . \tag{7.4}$$

Next, we should calculate the following partial derivative:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\Big(\int_{(\mathbf{I}_x, \tilde{g})} g_{lj}\Big) :=$$

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{1}{\delta}\Big\{ \int_{\mathbf{I}_{x+\delta \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}}} g_{lj}(x + \delta \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}, y_{x+\delta \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}}) \sqrt{det\tilde{g}(x + \delta \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}, y_{x+\delta \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}})}\, d\Omega_{y_{x+\delta \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}}}$$

$$- \int_{\mathbf{I}_x} g_{lj}(x, y_x)\, \sqrt{det(g)}\, d\Omega_{y_x} \Big\}.$$

$\mathbf{I}_{x+\delta \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}}$ is the indicatrix in the point z with coordinates $z^k = x^k + \delta\, \delta^{ki}$.

The problem is to evaluate the first integral in the above limit. In particular, the integration domain $\mathbf{I}_z$ depends of the point of the manifold where we are calculating the partial derivative. We can use the following approach: since the integrand is invariant under positive scaling $y \to \lambda y$, $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}^+$, we can transform by homotopy the integrals on the indicatrix to the Euclidean sphere (for a generic point $z \in \mathbf{M}$):

$$\int_{\mathbf{I}_z} g_{lj}(z, y_z)\, \sqrt{det(\tilde{g})} d\Omega_{y_z} = \int_{\mathbf{S^n}_z} \Big| jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I}_z}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_z}) \Big|_{(z, \tilde{y}_z)} g_{lj}(z, \tilde{y}_z)\, \sqrt{det(\tilde{g})}\, d\Omega_{\tilde{y}_z}. \tag{7.5}$$

The second integral corresponds to the integration of the function $\Big(\Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I}_z}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_z})\Big|_{(z,\tilde{y}_z)}$ $g_{lj}(z,\tilde{y}_z)\,\sqrt{det(\tilde{g})}\Big)$ in the Euclidean sphere $\mathbf{S^n}_z$ with the Euclidean volume $d\Omega_{\tilde{y}_z}$. Since the Euclidean spheres are isometric, we obtain making use of this isometry the following relation:

$$\int_{\mathbf{S^n}_z} \Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I}_z}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_z})\Big|_{(z,\tilde{y}_z)} g_{lj}(z,\tilde{y}_z)\,\sqrt{det(\tilde{g})}\,d\Omega_{\tilde{y}_z} =$$

$$= \int_{\mathbf{S^n}_x} \Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I}_z}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_x})\Big|_{(x,\tilde{y}_x)} g_{lj}(x,\tilde{y}_x)\,\sqrt{det(\tilde{g})}\,d\Omega_{\tilde{y}_x}. \tag{7.6}$$

This can be shown in the following way. For any homogeneous function g of degree zero in y, the following condition holds:

$$\int_{\mathbf{S^n}_x} g(x, y_{x+\delta\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{y}^i}}(\tilde{y}_x)) \,-\, g(x,\tilde{y}_x)) \,= 0.$$

Developing $y(\tilde{y}) \,=\, \tilde{y} + \delta R^i_k \tilde{y}^k \frac{\partial g}{\partial y^i}$, we note that being an isometry of the sphere and also preserving the orientation, $R \in \mathbf{SO}(n)$. Then the difference between the integrals is given by:

$$\int_{\mathbf{S^n}_x} g(x, y_{x+\delta\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}}(\tilde{y}_x)) \,-\, g(x,\tilde{y}_x)) \,= \int_{\mathbf{S^n}_x} \tilde{y}^k\, R^i_k\, \frac{\partial g}{\partial \tilde{y}^i}(\tilde{y}_x).$$

We can make disappear the rotation, just making the inverse transformation because the transformed function $\tilde{g}$ is also homogeneous (it is just a linear combination of the original ones). Then the second integral is

$$\int_{\mathbf{S^n}_x} \tilde{y}^k\, R^i_k\, \frac{\partial g}{\partial \tilde{y}^i}(\tilde{y}_x) = \int_{\mathbf{S^n}_x} \tilde{\tilde{y}}^k\, \frac{\partial \tilde{g}}{\partial \tilde{\tilde{y}}^i}(\tilde{\tilde{y}}_x) = 0,$$

because the radial derivative of a homogeneous function of degree zero is zero.

If the point z has coordinates $z^k = x^k + \delta\, \delta^{ik}$ and developing the integrand up to second order in δ around x:

$$\int_{\mathbf{S^n}_x} \Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I}_z}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_x})\Big|_{(x,\tilde{y}_x)} g_{lj}(x,\tilde{y}_x)\,\sqrt{det(\tilde{g})}\,d\Omega_{\tilde{y}_x} =$$

$$= \int_{\mathbf{S^n}_x} \Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I}_x}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_x})\Big|_{(x,\tilde{y}_x)} g_{lj}(x,\tilde{y}_x)\,\sqrt{det(\tilde{g})}\,d\Omega_{\tilde{y}_x} +$$

$$+ \int_{\mathbf{S^n}_x} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\Big|_x \Big(\Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I}_z}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_x})\Big|_{(x,\tilde{y}_x)} g_{lj}(x,\tilde{y}_x)\,\sqrt{det(\tilde{g})}\Big)\,d\Omega_{\tilde{y}_x} + Ord(\delta^2).$$

The partial derivative of the integral is:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\Big(\int_{(\mathbf{I}_x,\tilde{g})} g_{lj}\Big) = \int_{\mathbf{S^n}_x} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}|_x\Big(\Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I}_z}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_x})\Big|_{(x,\tilde{y}_x)} g_{lj}(x,\tilde{y}_x)\,\sqrt{det(\tilde{g})}\Big)d\Omega_{\tilde{y}_x}.$$

Therefore the derivative of the metric components h_{lj}

$$\frac{\partial h_{lj}}{\partial x^i} = \frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)}\ < g(tr\,\dot{A},\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}) > \int_{\mathbf{I}_x} g_{lj}\sqrt{det\tilde{g}}\,d\Omega_{\tilde{y}_x} +$$

$$+\frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)}\Big(\int_{\mathbf{S^n}_x}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}|_x\Big(\Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I}_z}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_x})\Big|_{(x,\tilde{y}_x)} g_{lj}(x,\tilde{y}_x)\,\sqrt{det(\tilde{g})}\Big)\,d\Omega_{\tilde{y}_x}\Big) =$$

$$\frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)}\ < g(tr\,\dot{A},\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}) > \int_{\mathbf{I}_x} g_{lj}\sqrt{det\tilde{g}}\,d\Omega_{\tilde{y}_x} +$$

$$+\frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)}\Big(\int_{\mathbf{S^n}_x}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}|_x\Big(\Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I}_z}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_x})\Big|_{(x,\tilde{y}_x)}\Big)\, g_{lj}(x,\tilde{y}_x)\,\sqrt{det(\tilde{g})}\,d\Omega_{\tilde{y}_x}\Big) +$$

$$+\frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)}\Big(\int_{\mathbf{I}_x}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}|_x\Big(\,g_{lj}(x,\tilde{y}_x)\Big)\,\sqrt{det(\tilde{g})}\,d\Omega_{\tilde{y}_x}\Big) +$$

$$+\frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)}\Big(\int_{\mathbf{I}_x} g_{lj}(x,\tilde{y}_x)\,\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}|_x\Big(\sqrt{det(\tilde{g})}\Big)\,d\Omega_{\tilde{y}_x}\Big).$$

Recalling the definitions of ϑ^k_l and γ^k_{ij}, we also define the following coefficients:

$$(\vec{\nabla} vol\mathbf{I}_x)^k_{ij} := \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbf{I}_x}\Big(\delta^k_j g(tr\dot{A},\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}) + \delta^k_i\, g(tr\dot{A},\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}) -$$

$$-h_{ij}h^{kl}\,g(tr\dot{A},\frac{\partial}{\partial x^l})\Big)\sqrt{\tilde{g}}\,d\Omega_{\tilde{y}},$$

$$\Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I}_z}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_x})\Big|^k_{ij} := \frac{1}{2}\Big(\int_{\mathbf{S^n}_x}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}|_x\Big(\Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I}_z}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_x})\Big|_{(x,\tilde{y}_x)}\Big)\,\vartheta^k_j(x,\tilde{y}_x)\,\sqrt{det(\tilde{g})}\,d\Omega_{\tilde{y}_x}\Big) +$$

$$+\frac{1}{2}\Big(\int_{\mathbf{S^n}_x}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}|_x\Big(\Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I}_z}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_x})\Big|_{(x,\tilde{y}_x)}\Big)\,\vartheta^k_i(x,\tilde{y}_x)\,\sqrt{det(\tilde{g})}\,d\Omega_{\tilde{y}_x}\Big) -$$

$$-\frac{1}{2}\Big(\int_{\mathbf{S^n}_x} h_{ij}\,h^{kl}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^l}|_x\Big(\Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I}_z}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_x})\Big|_{(x,\tilde{y}_x)}\Big)\,\sqrt{det(\tilde{g})}\,d\Omega_{\tilde{y}_x}\Big),$$

and also

$$(log\sqrt{det(\tilde{g})})^k_{ij} := \frac{1}{2}\Big(\int_{\mathbf{I}_x}\vartheta^k_j\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}(log\sqrt{\tilde{g}})\,\sqrt{det(\tilde{g})}\,d\Omega_{\tilde{y}_x} +$$

$$+\int_{\mathbf{I}_x}\vartheta^k_i\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}(log\sqrt{\tilde{g}})\,\sqrt{det(\tilde{g})}\,d\Omega_{\tilde{y}_x}\Big)-$$
$$-\int_{\mathbf{I}_x}h_{ij}\,h^{kl}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^l}(log\sqrt{\tilde{g}})\,\sqrt{det(\tilde{g})}\,d\Omega_{\tilde{y}_x}.$$

With this notation, we have the following

Proposition 7.4 *Let* $(\mathbf{M},F)$ *be a Finsler structure and consider the average Riemannian structure* $(\mathbf{M},h)$*. Then the coefficients of the Levi-Civita connection* h *are given by the formula*

$$\tilde{\Gamma}^k_{ij} =<\ (\vec{\nabla} vol(\mathbf{I}_x))^k_{ij} + \vartheta^k_l\gamma^l_{ij} + (log\sqrt{det\tilde{g}})^k_{ij} + \Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I}_z}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_x})\Big|^k_{ij}\ >,\ i,j,k=1,...,n. \tag{7.7}$$

7.2 Proof of *Theorem 7.2*

In this sub-section we prove *Theorem 7.2*. However we need some additional results in the proof.

Corollary 7.5 *For a Landsberg space* $(\mathbf{M},F)$ *the function* $vol(\mathbf{I}_x)$ *is constant in* $\mathbf{M}$*.*

Proof: It is based on the fact that for Landsberg spaces $tr(\dot{A}) = 0$ and therefore it is a direct consequence of *proposition 7.4*. □

Theorem 7.6 *([10]) For a Landsberg space* $(\mathbf{I}_x,\tilde{g}_x)\cong(\mathbf{I}_z,\tilde{g}_z), \forall x,z\in\mathbf{M}$*.*

Corollary 7.7 *For a Landsberg space* $(\mathbf{M},F)$ *there is a transformation* $\phi : \mathbf{S}^n_x \longrightarrow \mathbf{I}_z$ *such that the jacobian* $\Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I}_z}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_x})\Big|$ *is constant in* $\mathbf{M}$*,* $\forall x,z\in\mathbf{M}$*.*

Proof: It is a direct calculation; since the Euclidean Spheres are isometric, $\Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_z}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_x})\Big|_{(x,\tilde{y}_x)} = 1$ and the indicatrices are isometric Riemannian spaces, then $\Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I}_z}{\partial \mathbf{I}_x})\Big| = 1$. Therefore using this isometry, one obtains the following result:

$$\Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I}_z}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_z})\Big| = \Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I}_x}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_x})\Big|\,\Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I}_z}{\partial \mathbf{I}_x})\Big|\,\Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_x}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_z})\Big| = \Big|jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I}_x}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_x})\Big|.$$

□

Corollary 7.8 *For a Landsberg space* $(\mathbf{M},F)$ *the function* $\sqrt{\det\tilde{g}}$ *is constant on the manifold* $\mathbf{M}$*.*

Proof: Let us call the isomorphism between indicatrices of a Landsberg space by $\phi_1 : \mathbf{I}_x \longrightarrow \mathbf{I}_z$. Because of this isometry, we obtain:

$$(\phi_1^* \tilde{g}_{(x,\xi)}) y^i y^j \ = \tilde{g}_{(z,\phi_1(\xi))}(\phi_{1*}y, \phi_{1*}y) = \tilde{g}_{(x,\xi)}(y,y).$$

Consider the value $\tilde{g}_x(\xi, v) = \tilde{g}_{ij}(x,\xi)v^i v^i$ and in particular for $\xi^i = y^i = v^i$ in the corresponding coordinates induced from normal coordinates in $\mathbf{M}$. Then $\tilde{g}_x(y,y) = \tilde{g}_x(y) = \tilde{g}(z, \phi_{1*}y)$ and the result follows. $\Box$

Proposition 7.9 *For a Landsberg space* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *the coefficients of the Levi-Civita connection are:*

$$\Gamma^k_{ij}(x) = \frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)} \int_{\mathbf{I}_x} \vartheta^k_l \gamma^l_{ij}(x,y). \tag{7.8}$$

Proof: It is a direct consequence of *Lemma 7.5* and *Corollaries 7.7, 7.8* and *equation 7.7.* $\Box$

We recall that given a Finsler structure with a fundamental tensor g, there is associated a set of Finsler structures with fundamental tensor $g_t = (1-t)g + th$, $t \in [0,1]$, corresponding to the interpolating Finsler structures $(\mathbf{M}, F_t)$.

Lemma 7.10 *Let* $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ *be a Landsberg space such that the spheres* $(\mathbf{S^n}_x, F)$ *are also isometric* $\forall x \in \mathbf{M}$. *Then for the interpolating structures* $(\mathbf{M}, F_t)$, $t \in [0,1]$ *the Jacobians* $\left| jac(\frac{\partial \mathbf{I(t)}_x}{\partial \mathbf{S^n}_x}) \right|$ *are constant.*

Proof: Let us consider a dilatation transforming the sphere $\mathbf{S^n}_x$ to the indicatrix $\mathbf{I}(t)_x$:

$$\sigma_x \mathbf{S^n}_x \longrightarrow \mathbf{I}(t)_x$$
$$y_s \longrightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{(1-t)F^2(x,y_s) + t}} y_s = \sigma_t(x, y_s) y_s.$$

This transformation can be related with the homotopy transforming $\mathbf{S^n}_x$ onto $\mathbf{I}_x$ $\sigma_0(x, y_s)$:

$$\sigma_t(x,y_s)y_s = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(1-t) + \frac{t}{F^2(x,y_s)}}} \sigma_0(x,y_s)y_s = \phi(t,x,y_s)\sigma_0(x,y_s)y_s.$$

$\phi(t,x,y_s)$ is invariant by the isometries from the spheres $\mathbf{S^n}_x$ because by a similar argument than in *Corollary 7.8* here $F^2(t)$ is also constant under the isometries from $(\mathbf{S^n}_x, \tilde{g})$ to $(\mathbf{S^n}_z, \tilde{g})$. Using *Corollary 7.7*, the Jacobian of the transformation $\mathbf{S^n}_x \longrightarrow \mathbf{I}(t)_x$ is also constant in $\mathbf{M}$. $\Box$

Corollary 7.11 *Let ($\mathbf{M}$,F) be a Landsberg space such that the Riemannian manifolds $(\mathbf{S^n}_z, \tilde{g}_z)$, $z \in \mathbf{M}$ are isometric $\forall x \in \mathbf{M}$. Then for the intermediate spaces $(\mathbf{M}, F_t)$ the coefficients of the Levi-Civita connection of ∇^h are:*

$$\Gamma^k_{ij}(t) = \frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)} \int_{\mathbf{I}_x} \vartheta^k_l(t)\gamma^l_{ij}(t). \tag{7.9}$$

In particular there is a local coordinate system where

$$\frac{1}{vol(\mathbf{I}_x)} \int_{\mathbf{I}_x} \vartheta^k_l(t)\gamma^l_{ij}(t) = 0. \tag{7.10}$$

Proof: Because the metric h is the same for all the structures $(\mathbf{M}, F_t)$, the Levi-Civita connection is also the same for all $t \in [0,1]$ and then $\Gamma^k_{ij}(0) = \Gamma^k_{ij}(1) = \Gamma^k_{ij}(t)$. Since it is a linear, torsion free connection there is a local coordinate system in $\mathbf{M}$ such that at the point x the coefficients of the connection are zero. In addition, we are under the same hypothesis that in the proof of the *equation* (7.8), because although the intermediate Finsler structures $(\mathbf{M}, F_t)$ are not necessarily Landsberg, the intermediate jacobian are constant (by the *Lemma 7.10*), the volume functions $vol(\mathbf{I}(t)_x)$ are constant and the determinant of the induced metrics $det(\tilde{g}(t))$ are also constant in $\mathbf{M}$; the isometry in the spheres $(\mathbf{S^n}_z, \tilde{g}_z)$ implies the last two results. Since the intermediate structures define the corresponding Chern's connections of a Finsler structure, there is a local coordinate system on $\mathbf{M}$ such that *equations 7.9* and *7.10* hold. □

Proof of *Theorem* 7.2

The proof consists to show that the integrand in *equation 7.10* is zero.

Consider a point $y \in \mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$ such that $F_{t_0}(x,y) = 1$, $t_0 \in [0,1]$. At this point, the projection on $\mathbf{I}(t_0)$ is surrounded by indicatrizes, because locally the set of indicatrizes $\{\mathbf{I}(t),\, t \in (t_0 - \epsilon, t_0 + \epsilon)\}$ is a local foliation on the manifold $\mathbf{T}_x\mathbf{M}$, due to the condition $F^2(t) \neq F^2(0)$. We perform by dilatation, a local "up" deformation (dilatation of module ≥ 1) and a local down deformation (dilatation of module ≤ 1) such that both enclose the point $y \in \mathbf{I}_x(t_0)$. Then we have the condition:

$$0 = \int_{K_1} \rho_1\vartheta^k_l(t)\gamma^l_{ij}(t) - \int_{K_2} \rho_2\vartheta^k_l(t)\gamma^l_{ij}(t).$$

ρ_i are the jacobian coming from the dilatation transformations. Let us consider the function $\kappa = \rho\vartheta^k_l(t)\gamma^l_{ij}(t)$. Using Stokes theorem, (we can use it because the initial Finsler structure is C^4) and denoting by $N = K_1 \cup K_2$

and by $int(N)$ the "solid" manifold enclosing y such that the frontier is $\partial(int(N))=N$, one obtains

$$0=\int_N \kappa=\int_{int(N)} d_y\kappa,$$

where $d_y\kappa$ is the exterior differential of the $(n-1)$-form $\kappa\, dvol_{\tilde{g}}$. Using the average mean value theorem for multiples integrals,

$$0=\frac{1}{vol(int(N)_x)}d_y\kappa(y_\xi)\Longrightarrow 0=d_y\kappa(y_\xi)\Longrightarrow$$

$$\lim_{vol(int(N)_x)\to 0} d_y\kappa(y_\xi)=d_y\kappa(y)=0,\ y\in \mathbf{I}_x(t_0).$$

Let us consider in detail this condition in the case $lim_{t\longrightarrow 1^-}\, d_y\kappa(y)=0$. The weak limit exist in $t=1$ and it is null. But at $t=1$ the Christoffel symbols in some local coordinate system of $\mathbf{M}$ are $\gamma^k_{ij}=\Gamma^k_{ij}=0$, because the structure is Riemannian. Then $lim_{t\longrightarrow 1^-}\, d_y\kappa(y)=0$.

The exterior derivative condition $d_y\kappa(y)=0$ is

$$0=d_y\kappa(y)=\sum_s\frac{\partial\kappa}{\partial y^s}dy^s\,\big(\sum_k)y^k(-1)^{k-1}dy^1\wedge\cdots\wedge dy^{k-1}\wedge dy^{k+1}\cdots\wedge dy^n\,\big)=$$

$$=\sum_s y^s\frac{\partial\kappa}{\partial y^s}dy^1\,\wedge\cdots\,\wedge\, dy^n.$$

The condition $\sum_s y^s\frac{\partial\kappa}{\partial y^s}=0$ is equivalent to say that κ does not depend on t because t labels the radial foliation, that is, locally $t=\rho+\rho_0$. Therefore the constant value $\gamma^k_{ij}(0)=0$ holds because $\gamma^k_{ij}(1)=0$. Since the coefficients γ^k_{ij} are homogeneous functions, there is a coordinate system where $\gamma^k_{ij}(x,y,0)=0$ at x for almost all $y\in\mathbf{I}_x(0)$. Again, since the structure is enough differentiable, $\gamma^k_{ij}(x,y,0)=0$ in all $\mathbf{I}_x(0)$. But this implies that the structure $(\mathbf{M},F)$ is Berwald or locally Minkowski. □

Theorem 7.2 does not solves the problem if there are Landsberg spaces that are non Berwald, because for instance, the condition $F^2(x,y,t)\neq F^2(x,y,0)$ does not hold in general. One example is the following construction. Consider the set $\mathbf{I}_{x_0}\subset\mathbf{R^2}$, $x_0\in\mathbf{F^2}$, being F^2 a closed surface, defined by:

$$(y_1,y_2):=(cos\phi,sin\phi),\ \phi\in[0,\frac{\pi}{2}]\cup[\frac{3\pi}{2},2\pi];$$

$$(y_1, y_2) := e^{(\phi-\frac{\pi}{2})^4(\phi-\frac{3\pi}{2})^4}(cos\phi, sin\phi),\ \ \phi \in [\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}].$$

One can check that it is a strictly convex body because the factor $e^{(\phi-\frac{\pi}{2})^4(\phi-\frac{3\pi}{2})^4}$ only has one extremal point at $\phi = \frac{\pi}{2}$, π, $\frac{3\pi}{2}$ in the interval $[\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}]$. Suppose we promote this set as the indicatrix at the point x_0. Let us also consider defined in the manifold $\mathbf{M}$ a Riemannian metric $\bar{h}$. Using this Riemannian structure, we extend the indicatrix from x_0 to the whole manifold $\mathbf{M}$ by parallel translation, defining a set of indicatrix $\{\mathbf{I}_x,\ x \in \mathbf{M}\}$. This immediately defines a Finsler structure in $\mathbf{M}$ such that it has constant volume function $vol(\mathbf{I}_x)$ and is not Riemannian and not locally Minkowski such that it is not applicable *Theorem 7.2* (because $F_t = F$), $\forall t \in [0, 1]$.

8 Conclusion: the notion of convex invariance in Finsler Geometry

The average operation is not injective. From *Proposition* 3.17, any convex sum of fundamental tensors such that have the same average, produce the same average. In addition, the average metric h is invariant under average: $< h >= h$. Also any Riemannian structure is invariant, $< \bar{h} >= \bar{h}$. We can give some reasons to introduce this notion as a capital notion in our approach to Finsler geometry:

1. Invariance of the average metric: $< g_t >= h$.
2. Invariance of the formula for the connection coefficients of the average connection $\tilde{\Gamma}^i_{jk}$, *Corollary* 6.11.
3. Some proofs, like for instance *Theorem* 7.2 are based on this property, convex invariance.
4. Topological properties are also convex invariant, because they do not depend intrinsically of the metric structure.
5. The physical motivation of convex invariance was to obtain a geometric version of deterministic models at the Planck scale. A dissipative dynamics seems one of the main ingredients for these models ([5],[6]). We introduced this dissipation through the evolution towards the Riemannian structure of an initial non-symmetric structure (ref. [4] and for a more elaborate work see reference [11]).

These examples motivate the following definition:

Definition 8.1 *Let* $\{(\mathbf{M}, F_t),\ t \in [0,1]\}$ *be the interpolating Finsler structures and define the induced homotopy transformation* $\phi(t) : \pi^*\mathbf{\Gamma M} \longrightarrow \pi * \mathbf{\Gamma M}$ *in the following way: for any section* S *constructed on* F_t*, we associate the value* $S_t \in \pi^*\mathbf{\Gamma M}$*. A convex invariant property is such that it is invariant under this homotopy. Strong invariance is invariance for any* $t \in [0,1]$*; weak invariance only for the values* $\{t = 0, 1\}$.

One example of weak invariance is that the initial structure $(\mathbf{M}, F)$ can be a Landsberg structure, the intermediate $(\mathbf{M}, F_t)$, $t \in]0,1[$ can be not a Landsberg structure and the final structure $(\mathbf{M}, F_1)$ is again Landsberg (indeed it is Riemannian). One example of strong invariance is provided by the first example considered above.

Our idea is that convex invariance can be turned a method in the study of Finsler geometry. One can try to ask if a property is convex invariant or not. This point of view provides a method to generalize Riemannian theorems in the Finsler setting:

1. One can formulate a Riemannian theorem in a convex invariant way and then it is immediately valid in the Finsler category. This is based in the strong version of convex invariance.
2. Weak convex invariance is more complicated, requiring to understand the homotopy $\phi(t)$ in more complex cases.
3. The last step in this program is to understand the difference between Finsler and Riemannian geometry using convex invariance, or better non-convex invariance: we could associate the differences with non-convex invariant properties.

Convex invariance can also be used in the following way. Let us consider a property that holds in the Riemannian category. Then we define by homotopy a related property in the Finsler category that is reduced to the Riemannian case. This generalization can be considered as a proper generalization.

References

[1] A. Besse, *Einstein Manifolds*, Springer-Verlag (1986)

[2] D. Bao, S.S. Chern and Z. Shen, *An Introduction to Riemann-Finsler Geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 200, Springer-Verlag.

[3] S. Kobayashi and K. Nomizu, *Foundations of Differential Geometry, Vol I*, Wiley Intersciencie, New York (1969).

[4] R. Gallego, *A Finslerian version of 't Hooft Deterministic Quantum Models*, **math-ph/0501010**.

[5] Gerard't Hooft, *Determinism and Dissipation in Quantum gravity*, **hep-th/0003005**.

[6] Gerard't Hooft, *How does God play dies?(Pre-) Determinism at the Planck Scale*, **hep-th/0104219**.

[7] D. Bao, B. Lackey, *A Hodge decomposition theorem for Finsler Manifolds*, Compte Rendus Ac. Sc. Paris, **323**, 51-56 (1996).

[8] Z.I. Szabó, *Positive definite Berwald Spaces (Structure theorems on Berwald Spaces)*, Tensor, N.S. **35**, 25-39.

[9] D. Bao, Z. Shen, *On the Volume of Unit Tangent Spheres in a Finsler Manifold*, Results in Math. **Vol 26** (1994) 1-17.

[10] S.S. Chern, Z. Shen, *Riemann-Finsler Spaces*, Nankai Series in Math **Vol** 6, World Scientific.

[11] R. Gallego, *Quantum Systems as results of Geometric Evolutions* , **math-ph/0506038**.

[12] P. L. Antonelli, R. S. Ingarden, M. Matsumoto, *The Theory of Sprays and Finsler Spaces with Applications in Physics and Biology*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993.

[13] V. S. Matveev, *Closed manifolds admitting metrics with the same geodesics*, Proceedings of SPT2004 (Cala Gonone). World Scientific (2005), 198-209.

[14] V. S. Matveev, *Three-dimensional manifolds having metrics with the same geodesics*, Topology 42(2003) no. 6, 1371-1395.

[15] R. Gallego, *Remarks on Determinisitic Quantum Models based on Randers Spaces*, work in progress (hopefuly to finish soon).

[16] V. S. Matveev, *Hyperbolic manifolds are geodesically rigid*, Invent. math. 151(2003), 579-609.

[17] V. S. Matveev, *Riemann metrics having the same geodesics with Berwald metrics*, arXiv: 0811.0031 [math.DG].

[18] Z. Shen, *A Gauss-Bonnet formula for Finsler structures*, pre-print.

[19] S. S. Chern, *A Simple Intrinsic Proof of the Gauss-Bonnet Formula for Closed Manifolds*, Annals of Mathematics, Vol. (45), 747-752 (1944).

[20] S. Merkulov and L. Schwachhoefer, *Classification of irreducible holonomies of torsion-free affine connections*, Annals of Mathematics **150**(1999), 77150.